




Paul J. Kenz

Compliments of
Fuller Bergstresser!
August 1, 1896.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

BAPTISM

AND

FEET-WASHING.

BY

REV. P. BERGSTRESSER, D. D.,

AUTHOR OF VAIN EXCUSES ANSWERED, WAYNESBORO' DISCUSSION, ETC.

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA. :
LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY.
1896.

234.161
B 499b

32597

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY THE
LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

PREFACE.

THIS work has been undertaken to supply a felt want in our Lutheran Church. Ever since "The Waynesboro' Discussion," in 1879, of which debate only two thousand copies were published, we have been solicited for copies, from the East and West, and when the discovery was made that the edition was exhausted in a short time, some brethren in high position in the Church wrote to us, and urged us to prepare our arguments, on the various propositions discussed, and to publish them in separate book-form. The work now issued is an attempt to do this. This book is fuller on the propositions discussed than the debate, because we had more leisure to investigate the subjects.

Any person of ordinary intelligence can find in this work sufficient arguments for all ordinary purposes to refute those who make a dipping baptism essential to salvation, and also to convince them of our more beautiful and scriptural mode of baptism by pouring or sprinkling, as well as for the refutation of those who oppose Infant Baptism.

On Feet-Washing the treatise is quite full, and

should satisfy any impartial reader that there is no such sacrament commanded in the Word of God to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church.

The work is commended to the prayerful attention of the whole Church.

PETER BERGSTRESSER,

ROCKWOOD, PA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER I.	
THE DEFINITION OF BAPTISM.	13
CHAPTER II.	
JOHN'S BAPTISM	19
CHAPTER III.	
JESUS NOT DIPPED BY JOHN.	35
CHAPTER IV.	
BAPTIZO AND BAPTO	43
CHAPTER V.	
LUTHER NO IMMERSIONIST	60
CHAPTER VI.	
SCRIPTURE USAGE OF BAPTIZO	67
CHAPTER VII.	
PLACES WHERE BAPTISMS WERE PERFORMED	83
CHAPTER VIII.	
BAPTISM IN CHURCH HISTORY	106
CHAPTER IX.	
NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM	109

PART II.

THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

PAGE

CHAPTER X.

THE GREAT COMMISSION.	125
-------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE FITNESS OF CHILDREN FOR BAPTISM.	132
--	-----

CHAPTER XII.

THE APOSTLES AND CHURCH HISTORY	135
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT	143
----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED	157
-------------------------------	-----

PART III.

FEET-WASHING.

CHAPTER XV.

FEET-WASHING—NOT A SACRAMENT	189
--	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

THE LANGUAGE EMPLOYED	195
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVED	203
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

FEET-WASHING A JEWISH CUSTOM	209
--	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

THE TRUE DATE OF THE PASSOVER.	223
--	-----

CHAPTER XX.

JOHN AND SYNOPTISTS HARMONIZED	227
--	-----

INTRODUCTION.

THIS book needs no introduction. The author informs us in his preface that the book has been born of controversy, and comes forth in this new dress and enlarged enfoldment at the request of religious teachers, East and West, and in answer to a felt need in the Church. We have nothing of so comprehensive a character in the literature of the Church. We have some excellent manuals and tracts upon parts of the subject comprehended in this work, but no single volume so comprehensive in completeness and entirety of the subject as "Baptism and Feet-Washing." This work is not the child of an hour, but bears the marks of years of drudgery. Every paragraph exhibits the scholarly research and logical arrangement that characterize everything that Doctor Bergstresser has ever written. It is exhilarating, in these days of sham and pretense, to fall in with a naturalness and scholarly simplicity that make obscure things plain and the secrets of scholars common property.

Phillips Brooks, one of the greatest preachers that America has ever produced, once said, "Some books

are friends, and bring to us suggestions; some books are teachers, and come to us with systematic and well-ordered truth." If I were to devote myself to the piracy of paragraphing, I know of no sentence in the English language that so truly characterizes the work that has passed my examination on "Baptism and Feet-Washing" as, "Some books are teachers, and come to us with systematic and well-ordered truth." We always value a teacher for his truth. It is so with the author; he has but one story, and he tells it consistently from first to last, his enemies as his judges.

The work divides itself very naturally into three parts: First, The Mode of Baptism; second, The Subjects of Baptism; and third, Feet-Washing as a Sacrament. Part first, as to The Mode of Baptism, is an old battle-field, where ecclesiastics have displayed their cleverness all down the centuries. Naturally we would expect, upon this point, little other than the threshing over of old straw; but the reader will not have gone far into the book until he meets a delightful surprise of new faces on old truths. The new light brought to us upon the mode of Baptism is born, not of the dexterous handling of a concordance or the shrewd compilation of what has already been said and written upon the subject, but of scholarly exegesis, lifting into vision with convincing, masterly arrangement, passages hitherto omitted in the discussion of the mode of Baptism, displaying a most profound knowledge of the Word of God.

When we think of Dr. Dale and the small army of "and others" who have so thoroughly discussed the mode of Baptism, the tendency is to regard the final word on the mode of Baptism as spoken, and to turn a deaf ear to anything further. It may be well to remember, as suggested by another, that "The world moves now on the principle that everything thought to be settled and established on immutable foundations is just ripe for investigation." A very thoughtful reading of part first, *The Mode of Baptism*, fully justifies and verifies the suggestion, and at once demands a place and claims a most cordial and respectful hearing for the author. The chapters on the subjects of Baptism and Feet-Washing as a sacrament are especially helpful. The argument upon Infant Baptism is a marvel in clearness, and comes to us with a thoroughness of investigation that leaves no room for a demurrer. This chapter alone should place the book in every Sunday-school library in the Lutheran Church, and in the hands of every catechumen.

In part third, *Feet-Washing as a Sacrament*, we come upon hitherto unexplored territory. Rev. Prof. C. P. Krauth, D. D., LL.D., whose knowledge of books was far beyond that of ordinary men, when asked to cite a treatise upon the subject of Feet-Washing as a Sacrament, made answer, "I know of nothing upon the subject—have never seen nor read a treatise upon the subject." Beyond the casual reference made by the more scholarly commentators,

there is no formal treatise on the subject. To the city pastor, who is never called to rub against the shrewd sophistries of the quaint assumption of foot-washing as a sacrament, this chapter may mean little; but those pastors who are called to meet this misreading of the Divine Word will hail this third chapter as not only timely, but a downright benefaction. It is one thing to laugh at a fallacy, but quite another to disprove it. This third chapter stands out unique, not only from the rest of the volume, but from the whole realm of ecclesiastical literature, as the first thorough treatise upon the subject. It comes as the final word, for it leaves no place for an objection. It has even hopelessly divided the sect that urges foot-washing as a sacrament.

This book is good throughout, with not a dry chapter in it. Difficult things are made so plain that a novice in the study of the great doctrines that it elucidates, with it in hand, can pose as a master in the discussion of Baptism and Feet-Washing.

This book will be hailed by hundreds as not only an additional emphasis to Baptism as a sacrament, but as setting at rest forever all reasonable doubt as to its mode and subjects, and consigning to charitable forgetfulness the unscriptural assumption of foot-washing as a sacrament. This book is what Montaigne calls "vital and spermatic, not leaving the reader what he was; he shuts the book a richer man."

WILLIAM ALFRED SHIPMAN.

JOHNSTOWN, PA.

PART I.

THE MODE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

BAPTISM AND FEET-WASHING.

CHAPTER I.

THE DEFINITION OF BAPTISM.

It is in the interest of truth and for the glory of God that we undertake a thorough and radical investigation of the Mode of Christian Baptism, which must be learned from the definition of the word, from its use in the sacred Scriptures, and from the nature and design of the sacrament.

The investigation is not to be conducted as though we had any doubts of the validity of our baptism, or as though we had not yet entered into the temple of truth; but it is for the purpose of unveiling the glory of the truth, which we have discovered on this important subject, that all who hear and love the truth may be fully persuaded and established in it. This we are sure will be the case with all persons who come to the investigation of this subject with unprejudiced minds; for the Spirit of truth will guide them into all truth. As St. John says: "But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth

in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him," 1 John ii. 27. That is, if we have discovered the fundamental principle of truth, we shall be able to unfold this whole subject clearly, logically and scripturally, to the minds of all unprejudiced persons. But if we come to the investigation of any subject with prejudiced minds, enlisted under some sectarian shiboleth, we will not be able to discern truth from error. On this point a distinguished writer has said: "Let us agree to find out the truth, adhering closely to Scripture, carefully endeavoring to detect the cause of error, the first lie, which vitiates all the subsequent reasoning, and then it cannot be difficult for an unprejudiced mind to ascertain the truth." Herein lies good advice for every lover of the truth; and we will endeavor, as far as in us is, to follow it.

The great fundamental error, under which the whole Baptist system is laboring, consists in the erroneous meaning which it attaches to the Greek word *baptizo*, defining it as a definite act, *to dip*. On the heels of this error follow a great many others, some of which we may have occasion to point out in this discussion.

It appears from what St. Paul says in 1 Cor. i. 17, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," that there are some things, both in the Bible and also in nature, which are more important

than others. For instance, the finger-board pointing out the road to travelers is important; but the road itself is more important. The signs above your stores are important; but the goods in your stores are much more important. What benefit the sign or finger-board, if the goods be wanting or the road obstructed? So it is with baptism and the gospel. He that believeth not, though he be baptized, shall be damned. Baptism as a symbol of grace is important; but the preaching of the gospel, by which faith is received, is more important. We do not say that grace does not accompany baptism; but St. Paul evidently laid more stress on the inner than on the outer, more on preaching the gospel than on preaching baptism, the symbol of grace. Much more would St. Paul have protested against preaching about the mode of baptism to the neglect of preaching the gospel; turning the mode of baptism into a divine commandment, and teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Let us therefore follow the spirit of St. Paul, our apostle, the apostle of the Gentiles.

That is therefore wrong preaching which gives more prominence to the outer sign than to the inner grace; that has more to say about the mode of baptism, the washing of feet as a religious ceremony, the shape of the hat or cap, the holy kiss, and other traditional rudiments, than about "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith." Matt. xxiii. 23.

But yet it is necessary for the minister of the Word to instruct his people in the doctrines of the sacraments, which are Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In the discussion of the mode of Christian Baptism, we will consider in regular order the position of our Baptist friends, who are forever talking and preaching of the baptism of adults by *dipping*. The general position taken by Baptists, whether Tunkers, Campbellites, Millerites, or all the other numerous and diversified orders into which the Baptist persuasion is divided, may be summed up in the following particulars: "That Christian baptism is dipping, immersion, overwhelming, plunging. That baptism, both in its primary and secondary meaning, expresses dipping, and nothing else. Dipping is baptism, and baptism is dipping. Dipping only is baptism." That this is a fair statement of the Baptist position can be proved by opening any of their standard works on the subject.

We here lay down the plain proposition that the words of the Bible must be interpreted according to the meaning which the sacred writers attach to them. When we read a book, and desire to understand the author, we must interpret his words by the evident sense in which he employs them. We are not permitted to read obsolete meanings into his words, when he uses them in another well-received sense. So with the word *baptizo*. It has two meanings, a classical and a scriptural. We must not read the classical into the scriptural, or the scriptural into the

classical; the primary into the secondary, or the secondary into the primary. In the old classics *baptizo* means to sink something to the bottom of some fluid or element, and to leave it there, there being nothing in the original word to bring up that which was sunk to the bottom. Of this use of the word examples will be furnished further on.

There *is* a Greek word which signifies this double action, which is *bapto*, but *bapto* is never used in any passage of Scripture where the ordinance of baptism is mentioned. The word for the sacrament of baptism is always *baptizo*. With the word *dip* our Baptist friends also frequently associate the words *immerse*, *plunge*, *overwhelm*, etc., as if these were synonymous with *dip* and explanatory of *baptizo*. This is done to cover up the weakness of their position in asserting that the Greek word *baptizo*, throughout all the Greek classics and the Bible, means *dipping*, and nothing else. That this is a fair statement of the Baptist position can be proved by opening any of their standard works on the subject. In order to see this charge fully developed and proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, turn to James W. Dale, D. D., on *Classic Baptism*, a work which cannot be too highly estimated for settling forever this disputed word.

Now, before entering upon the discussion of this illogical and unscriptural position, which confounds *baptizo* with *bapto*, we will say once for all, that we do not find fault with our Baptist friends for choos-

ing to perform their baptism by *dipping*. This is a liberty of which we do not wish to deprive them. But the arrogant assumption with which it is sought to brand our baptism as not valid but profane, and the unwarrantable exclusiveness of denying us a place in the visible Church, or any good hope of heaven, we cannot give place to by subjection—no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel may continue with us. We stand therefore entirely on the defensive in this discussion, and demand the proof, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But we fear that the unity of the faith can never be secured on the Baptist basis, unless we all become immersionists against our honest convictions. We hold firmly to the Sacrament of Baptism, but administer it by affusion or sprinkling.

CHAPTER II.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

BAPTISTS endeavor to prove their position, that Baptism is dipping, and nothing else, by John's Baptism. The passages of Scripture mostly relied on are these: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins," Mark i. 4, 5. "And were baptized of him in Jordan," Matt. iii. 6.

Suppose we should admit, for the sake of argument, that John did *dip* in the river of Jordan, how would that prove that Christian Baptism is dipping, and nothing else? For if this was Christian Baptism, then John the Baptist, not Christ, instituted Christian Baptism. Who then did institute Christian Baptism? Christ instituted Christian Baptism, when he said to his disciples: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

The idea of Christian Baptism is poorly illustrated by putting a person into water and drawing him out; for ritual Baptism is a symbol agency, and not an enveloping element. Christian Baptism is a symbol of grace. The symbol is to be applied to the subject, and not the subject to the symbol element. The symbol is pure water, applied to the subject in the name of the Triune God, and the grace thus symbolized is the Holy Ghost, by whom alone we are brought into a permanently saved state or condition. As the Holy Spirit is applied to the subject, so also ought the water to be applied. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit," 1 Cor. xii. 13.

Such baptism is certainly not clearly illustrated by the act of *dipping*, putting one into this body, which is Christ, and withdrawing; but by Christian Baptism we are put into a permanent condition or state in Christ, which is never to be disturbed. Dipping does not illustrate a permanent state. But Christian Baptism is a permanent state of rest in Christ; "for we who have believed do enter into his rest," Heb. iv. 3. The Holy Spirit does not dip us into Christ, put into and withdrawn, but when He baptizes us into Christ, He puts us into a permanently saved condition, putting His laws into our hearts, and writing them in our minds, by which we are enabled to love and serve God in Christian liberty. Ritual Baptism only symbolizes this glorious condition; but it is the

Holy Spirit who pours the pure water of life into the soul. A dipping Baptism does not at all illustrate this idea, and therefore it is a worthless symbol, and never used in the Scriptures, because it leads the soul away from the true idea of Christian Baptism, making it to consist in the mere act or mode of its administration.

Christian Baptism therefore consists in the application of water to a subject in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, according to the divine command, as a symbol of spiritual purification, and as a token of Christian privileges. It is the sacrament of initiation into the visible church. The outer form of Baptism was not new when even Christian Baptism was introduced. It was connected with former Jewish ceremonies, as we shall see in the discussion of our subject. In the Old Testament there were washings and purifyings, which in the New Testament are called baptisms; and John the Baptist made use of water-baptism as a symbol of repentance and the remission of sins. That is, all who promised to repent of their sins, and to look to the Messiah for the remission of sins, John baptized with water. But Christ implanted in this ordinance a new signification, which is expressed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. By Christian Baptism we are to be received into fellowship with the Triune God. John's Baptism was therefore only a preparation for Christian Baptism.

This is evident from the fact that John's disciples

were re-baptized with Christian Baptism. If "all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem" were baptized by John, it is highly probable that many of the "three thousand," who were baptized with Christian Baptism on the day of Pentecost, had been among John's disciples.

But what shall we say of the twelve disciples of John, who were rebaptized by the order of St. Paul at Ephesus? Paul asked them, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them," Acts xix. 1-6. Now, for what was this Scripture given to us, but to teach us that John's baptism was not Christian Baptism, and that the principal thing in baptism is not much or little water, but the name of the Lord Jesus and the gift of the Holy Ghost? You will therefore see clearly that, if John's baptism was even performed by dipping, it is no proof that Christian Baptism is dipping, and nothing else; for John's baptism was only a preparation for Christian Baptism. And not neces-

sarily that; for there is no evidence that all the apostles were baptized with John's baptism.

But John himself makes a distinction between his baptism and that of which Christ should be the author. Let us read John's words: "And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost," John i. 33. See also Matt. iii. 13-17. The Spirit descended like a dove, and remained on Jesus. But the descent of a dove is like water poured out of a hand, or pitcher, or pump, upon some object. Should not the sign correspond with the thing signified? So forcibly did this point impress itself on the mind of Menno Simonis, the founder of the Mennonite church, that the greater part of that denomination have abandoned the practice of baptizing by dipping, and have introduced in its place the more scriptural, convenient, and beautiful mode of baptizing by pouring.

But we do not admit, by a good deal, that John's baptism was performed even by dipping; for it can be proved neither by the language employed in the transaction nor by history or tradition. The same quotation that says, "John baptized in the river Jordan," says also, "He baptized in the wilderness." If the former phrase means "*to dip into the water of Jordan*," then the latter also means "*to dip into the sand of the wilderness*;" but if the latter means

the locality where John was baptizing, then the former also means locality. But that both phrases, "*in the wilderness*" and "*in the Jordan*," mean locality, is evident to all those who are acquainted with the topography of the Jordan. The river Jordan has two banks on each side. The first, or inner bank, is that of the river in its natural state; and the second, or outer one, about the eighth of a mile distant, is its bank when it overflows. This overflowing is occasioned by the melting of snows on Lebanon and Hermon, in March and April. During the rest of the year, therefore, the river is in its natural state, between the inner banks, while between the inner and outer banks there is a wide space of rich pasture land, which afforded an excellent locality for the vast multitudes that frequented John's preaching. This corresponds with St. Luke's account of the matter: "The word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; as it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight," Luke iii. 3, 4. John was therefore in the Jordan land, not for the purpose of dipping the people into water, but that there he might have an excellent locality to preach the baptism of repentance; for the word, *river*, does not only include its water, but also its banks and its channel.

While no Baptist was ever known to base an argument for dipping on the Scripture statement that John was baptizing "*in the wilderness*," "*in Bethany*," "*in Enon*," yet the same identical form of statement, "*in the Jordan*," is made the basis of a universal argument for dipping into, covering over with *water*, although intelligent friends of the dipping theory admit that "*in the Jordan*" does as truly and as absolutely express locality as does "*in the wilderness*." By what authority, then, is the phrase, "*in the Jordan*," a locality, metamorphosed into "*in the water*," which is no locality; for John could not have his home in the water of Jordan, but he could, and he had, his home between the *inner* and the *outer* banks during the season he preached there his repentance baptism, which required a penitent state of mind. It was not a ritual baptism that he preached, but a repentance baptism, a penitent state of mind and heart, in which condition alone they could receive the forgiveness of their sins by believing on the Lamb of God, who was already, unconsciously to them, standing among them. There is therefore a great gulf separating John's position in relation to the river Jordan from the Baptist position. Baptists leave their preaching places, and seek out a river in whose waters they may *dip* by "*walking in to a convenient depth*," and by dipping the upper part of the body. There is not one word of any such doing in all the history of John's ministry. Where John preached, there he baptized. When he

preached in the wilderness, he baptized in the wilderness. When he preached in Bethany, he baptized in Bethany. When he preached in Enon, he baptized in Enon. When he preached in the Jordan land, he baptized in the Jordan land.

Olshausen says: "The wilderness is spoken of as the place where John preached, which is not to be understood, of course, as literally void of men, but rather as pasture grounds. But in the fact that John preached in the wilderness and not in towns, we discover the particular character of this witness of the truth. It belongs to John's character to flee from men and to preach to those that seek him; while the Redeemer Himself seeks men. The wilderness of Judea bordered on the Jordan and the Dead Sea." Olshausen thinks that the ministry and the places of John's ministry have some other characteristics than that of dipping and its conveniences. John's wilderness home, his camel's hair apparel, his locust food, his repentance preaching, all told of the severity of the law, to whose dispensation he still belonged, and of preparation for the welcome reception of grace and truth by Jesus Christ.

In view of what has now been said about the locality of "the Jordan," the accounts given by Matthew and Mark of the baptism of Jesus by John, can be more easily understood: "Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan, to be baptized of him," Matt. iii. 13. "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of

John in Jordan," Mark i. 9. Jesus came from the land of Galilee into the land of Jordan, from one locality to another, where John preached the baptism of repentance.

But what is repentance? This we must know in order to learn what John preached. John designed by his preaching to awaken in his hearers those feelings of sorrow and remorse which are excited in a sinner by a knowledge of his sinfulness and danger. By the law is the knowledge of sin. John was a preacher of the law. This was his mission. The age in which he lived was very corrupt. He was the man for the times. He was a truly great man. He was so proclaimed by the Lord Himself. John preached the law to awaken his hearers to repentance. The way of salvation is through the Law into the Gospel. "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God," Gal. ii. 19. The law serves the gospel. The law is our school-master to bring us to Christ. The law furnishes the moral discipline to be passed through to Christian liberty. Man in his fallen state is under the control of sin, and not under the control of holiness. Regeneration is the radical change of this governing disposition of following sin in preference to holiness and righteousness. "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death," 2 Cor. vii. 10. This shows that repentance is a changed condition of man's mind. This is what John preached. He

endeavored by his preaching to change the people's minds, and to turn them to the Lord. He did not preach a dipping baptism; but he preached the baptism of repentance into the remission of sins. Or, in other words, he preached in order to bring about a condition of repentance in the minds of his hearers, and to lead them to the coming Messiah for the remission of their sins. They did not find the forgiveness of their sins in their repentance and in their baptism, but by these means they were brought into a condition to seek and find forgiveness by faith in the Lamb of God. For John cried and said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," John i. 29. But is godly sorrow an act or a condition of soul? It is a condition of soul, in which faith alone can spring up, by which we are enabled to lay hold of Christ and salvation. The acts of the soul proceed from the will, which, in the impenitent sinner, is inclined to evil, and is turned from sin only when the heart is made sorrowful and sad by contemplating its sinfulness. This is the poverty of spirit to which Jesus alludes in His Sermon on the Mount, where He says: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," Matt. v. 3.

When the Prodigal Son had "come to himself," he said: "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!" Here were the feelings of sorrow and remorse awakened in his heart, as he contemplated his

sinfulness and danger. We have in this a touch of the deepest nature, drawn by the pen of inspiration; for there is nothing which so causes the sinner to feel the discord which he has introduced into his inner being by his sins, as to compare himself with all things around him and beneath him. It was not until his heart had received the repentance baptism that the Prodigal said: "I will arise and go to my Father."

But this was the very state or condition of mind into which John the Baptist labored by his preaching and the operations of the Holy Spirit to bring his hearers; he preached the baptism of repentance, and had nothing to say about a ritual baptism, much less about a dipping into water baptism. This he distinctly announced to the vast multitudes that came to hear him, when he said: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance (Greek, *into repentance*)," Matt. iii. 11. Again: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance (Greek, *baptized the baptism of repentance*)," Acts xix. 4. John baptized those who were brought into the right condition of mind and heart to look to the Messiah for redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

This is further evident from the nature of John's baptism, which was a symbol of purification, which was done by sprinkling or pouring. "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying," John iii. 25. The priests and the Levites of Jerusalem also asked John,

“Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ?” That is, “Why purifiest thou then, if thou be not that Christ?” John answered them, “I baptize with water: that is, ‘I purify with water,’ but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not.” As though he would say: “I purify you ceremonially with water, but He shall purify you with the Holy Ghost.”

With this idea of baptism as a symbol of spiritual purification, both the Jews and Gentiles, in those days, were quite familiar. It is notorious that both Jews and Gentiles attached a specifical purifying value to *running* water. Thus the Roman high priest addressed the Sabine, “What are you about to do, O stranger? Would you sacrifice impurely to Diana? Sprinkle yourself first with the living stream. The Tiber flows before you in the bottom of the valley.”

Philo the Jew says, “It is the custom of nearly all others to *sprinkle* for purification with pure water; many with that of the sea, some with that of rivers, and some with that of vessels they had drawn up from wells.”

The Old Testament required the use of running or living water for religious purification. “And he shall dip them in the *running* water and sprinkle the house seven times: and he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, and with the running water,” Lev. xiv. 51, 52.

The Gentile and the Jews alike went to the flowing stream, not because of the quantity of water to

be found there, but because of its quality or character. They sought for running, living, therefore pure, water, and having found this, so much as would suffice for a sprinkling or pouring was a quantity sufficient for them. The custom of resorting to rivers, therefore, for religious purification, because of the greater purifying power of running water, is a custom of Eastern origin, and is continued to the present day. The Rev. Dr. Jamieson says, "The usual mode of bathing by the Hindoos is by *pouring* water over their persons from a vessel called *lota*, when they stand on the bank of a river. In washing hands both Hindoos and Mohammedans always *pour* water on them. They say that to dip them into water defiles the water, and thus the more you wash the more unclean you are."

Now, did John baptize by dipping or by sprinkling? He did not baptize by dipping, but by sprinkling or pouring, for the following reasons:

1. John himself says that he baptized *with* water. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance," Matt. iii. 11. "*With water*," in the original Greek, is in the dative case, which shows the instrument with which anything is done. "I drive a nail with a hammer." "I sweep the room with a broom." "I plow the field with a plow." "I baptize with water." All these show the modes or instruments with which the things are accomplished. The water, according to John's language, was applied to the person, and not the person to the water.

2. Jesus uses the same language with regard to John's baptism, and makes our position still stronger. Jesus says to His apostles: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," Acts i. 5. This language of Jesus is in the precise form. "*With water*," in both cases, is the instrumental dative. Christ even omits the preposition before the dative, which establishes our position beyond the shadow of a doubt.

3. But St. Peter uses the same language in reference to John's baptism, which from the circumstances in the case is still stronger testimony in our favor. The passage is found in his defense before "those of the circumcision," for having entered into the house of Cornelius, a Gentile, and preached the gospel. "As I began to speak," he said, "the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost," Acts xi. 15, 16. How did this event remind St. Peter of John's mode of baptism? It was by seeing the Holy Ghost fall upon his hearers, as on the day of Pentecost. If there was no resemblance between the two baptisms, how came the mind of the apostle to be refreshed with what he saw? What then did he see? He saw the *pouring* down of the Holy Spirit. Substitute *dip* for *pour* in the passage: "John indeed *dipped* you with water; but ye shall be *dipped* with the Holy Ghost. Shocking abuse of language and principle!

4. Moreover, that John's baptism was by sprinkling or pouring, and not by dipping, we draw from the fact that he was a teacher of the law of Moses, which required sprinkling or pouring for ceremonial purification. Malachi closed his book with these solemn words: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded you in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." As if he would say: "You are not now to expect any further succession of prophets, nor indeed any other prophet till the Messiah and His Forerunner. Therefore let your chief care till then be to observe the institutions and obey the precepts which Moses has given you in the law, as preparatory to the full revelation of the gospel." The prophet continues: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." Jesus said that John was the Elijah who was to come. And the angel Gabriel said to Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, before John was born: "Many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." This proves that John was a teacher of the law, and still belonged to the Old Testament dispensation.

What, then, was the mode of consecration according to the Law? Was it not by sprinkling or pouring? In Numbers viii. 6, 7, we read: "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." Of the Messiah it is said: "So shall he sprinkle many nations," Is. lii. 15. And in Ezek. xxxvi. 25, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." Consecration in the Old Testament was therefore done by sprinkling or pouring; and as John was a teacher of the Law, and had to fulfil all righteousness, and as he was the Forerunner of the Messiah who was "to sprinkle many nations," we conclude that his mode of baptism was by sprinkling or pouring.

CHAPTER III.

JESUS NOT DIPPED BY JOHN.

MATT. iii. 13-17 says: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John (to Jordan land, where John had his home for the time being) to be baptized of him. But John forbade Him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered Him." From this we gather that neither John, as the Forerunner, nor Jesus, as the Messiah, could depart from the teachings of the Law of consecration. In addition to which Jesus says in His Sermon on the Mount: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil," Matt. v. 17, 18.

What then was the required law of purification which John and Jesus were bound to fulfil? The purifications were for the most part performed with water, sometimes with oil (Ex. xxx. 26-29; Lev. viii. 10, 11); and sometimes with blood (Heb. ix. 19-22). The water of purification was to be drawn from a spring or running stream, and was either pure or

mixed with blood (Heb. ix. 13, 14), or with the ashes of a red heifer. For preparing these ashes, a heifer of a red color was burnt with great solemnity. As all the people were to be interested in it, the victim was to be provided at their charge. This Jewish rite certainly had a reference to things done under the gospel, as St. Paul has remarked in his Epistle to the Hebrews, where he says: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14. Paul makes use of the same thought in his Epistle to the Ephesians, where he says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Let it be remembered that it behooved Jesus and John to fulfil all righteousness. We have already considered the relation which John sustained to the Law. Let us next take up that of Jesus. Righteousness means conformity to the Divine Law.

Where, then, in the Old Testament, is the law which required Jesus to be baptized? It is not found in the Ten Commandments, which He fulfilled to the

very jot and tittle. But it behooved Him to fulfil "all righteousness." He had to fulfil the law of consecration, appertaining to the priesthood. Jesus is our High Priest, not after the order of Aaron, but a priest after the order of Melchisedec. As our High Priest, it was necessary that Christ should fulfil all the law pertaining to His office; not in the shadow, but in the substance. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." These points St. Paul clearly sets forth in his Epistle to the Hebrews. "Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people," Heb. ii. 17. "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus," Heb. iii. 1. "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," Heb. iv. 14, 15. See further, in this same line, Heb. v. 1-10; vii. 1-28; viii. 1-13; ix. 1-25; x. 1-22.

What, therefore, was the law of the priests?
 1. They could not officiate as priests, or ministers of

religion, until they were thirty years of age. In proof of this we have Numbers iv. 23, "From thirty years old and upward until fifty years old shalt thou number them; all that enter in to perform the service, to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation." See also verses 30, 35, 39, 43, 47, of the same chapter. This is clear.

St. Luke tells us that when Jesus was about thirty years of age, He was baptized, and began His ministry. Why was not Jesus baptized sooner? Why did He wait until He was thirty years of age before He entered on his office as priest? The law required it.

2. Having waited to the legal age, He must be set apart, or consecrated, to His ministry. What was the law on this subject? In Numbers viii. 7, "And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." But this is not all. In Ex. xix. 7, we read: "Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head." Again, in Ex. xxx. 25, we read: "And thou shalt make it an oil of holy ointment, an ointment compounded after the art of the apothecary: it shall be a holy anointing oil." Christ is the *anointed* one. St. Peter preached to Cornelius: "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with Him." He was baptized with water and the Holy Ghost. These two elements, water and the Holy

Ghost, were applied, one like the other. If Jesus was baptized with the Holy Ghost, He was also baptized with water. You might just as well say He was *dipped* in oil as to say He was *dipped* in water.

It is then settled by the law and the prophets that John did not *dip* Jesus in water. But if he baptized Jesus by sprinkling or pouring according to the law, why should he baptize others by a different mode? Was it lawful for him to baptize them in any other manner or mode than by sprinkling or pouring? If so, where is the law that gave him permission? To the law and to the testimony!

Jesus therefore might have stood at the brink of the river, there being no evidence to the contrary from the Greek text, or He might have stood a little way in the water, and been baptized by sprinkling or pouring. For in the Catacombs of Rome, into which the early Christians were driven by persecution, there are elaborate paintings, and in one of these paintings, found in the cemetery of Pontianus, is a representation of our Lord's baptism. In the painting the Lord is portrayed as standing in the water, up to His waist, with a halo about His head, the dove descending from heaven, and John the Baptist standing on the bank of the Jordan with his right hand on Christ's head, and holding a hyssop branch in his left. This is stronger evidence that Jesus was baptized by sprinkling or pouring than that He was baptized by dipping. It looks very much like the Jewish mode of dedication. "For when

Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you," Heb. ix. 19, 20.

This painting in the cemetery of Pontianus and the Hindoo use of the *lota*, remind us of a very strong argument deduced from the language of the Fore-runner in John iii. 34, "For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure (*ek metrou, out of a measure*) unto him." The argument is this. Other ancient pictures represent John as baptizing by pouring water "*out of a measure*" (a vessel resembling a shell), and as suggested by this and in contrast with it, that the Lord Jesus is baptized with the Holy Ghost, not "*out of a measure*," but immeasurably.

Moreover, it would have been physically impossible for John in his short ministry to have baptized by dipping the vast multitudes that came to his baptism; and yet it is said that they were all baptized by himself. Matt. iii. 6, "And were baptized of him."

But Jesus Himself tells us, as has already been intimated, how John baptized. He certainly knew, and His testimony is conclusive. Here are His own words: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," Acts i. 5. You perceive that Jesus

says, "John truly baptized *with* water"—not *in* water, but *with* water; applying the element to the subject, not the subject to the element. It will not do to translate this *in* water; for the original *hudati, water*, is the dative of instrument without a preposition. You could say, "I drive a nail *with* a hammer," but not *in* a hammer, and convey the same idea.

Suppose we substitute for *baptised* and *with*, the words *dipped* and *in*, and let us see how it will read, in the last text quoted. Thus: "For John truly *dipped in* water; but ye shall be *dipped in* the Holy Ghost." But the disciples were not *dipped in* the Holy Ghost; for He was *poured out* upon them, according to the prediction of the prophet Joel.

Jesus was also baptized by John *with* water in order to give validity or sanction to John's baptism as being divine and for a specific purpose, which was to cease, and which did cease with the death of John. Look at (compare) this verse: "And I knew Him not: but that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." These are the words of John, who well understood his mission. He said: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias." Again, "He must increase, but I must decrease." Christ also made His baptism by John the occasion for entering on His own blessed mission. As High Priest of the Church of God, He was consecrated first by baptism,

then by the divine unction, the Holy Ghost, and lastly by the sacrifice of Himself. (Ex. xxix. 4; Ex. xl. 12-15; Lev. viii. 1-30; Heb. x. 10.) Thus in His own language He "fulfilled all righteousness." He was not baptized like others to repentance for the remission of sins; for He was without sin, and He was the Christ to whom the people were exhorted by John to look for the remission of sins.

In Christ's baptism we have also an explanation of John iv. 2. For the same reason that He was baptized by John, He permitted His own disciples, some of whom had formerly been John's disciples, to baptize the people unto repentance for the remission of sins. This was essentially John's baptism; for Christian baptism was not yet instituted, Christ having been not yet glorified.

CHAPTER IV.

BAPTIZO AND BAPTO.

HAVING now disposed of John's baptism, and having found no ground for the assertion that it was performed by dipping and nothing else, and having showed that it was not Christian baptism at any rate, and that Jesus was not dipped, we will next investigate more minutely the definitions of *baptizo* and *bapto*, which our Baptist friends say mean *dip* and nothing else, and that therefore there is no valid baptism but that which is administered by dipping the candidate in water and drawing him out again. Baptist writers, however, do not agree among themselves in their definition of *baptizo*, neither do they harmonize in their opinions as to the relation which *bapto* sustains to *baptizo*. Neither do they harmonize in their practice. As long therefore as they cannot harmonize their own teachings in respect to these much-disputed words, nor agree in their practice, they can hardly blame us; but they should rather thank us for pointing out the radical error under which they are laboring. We regard our work therefore in this direction as eminently serving the cause of truth, both in establishing our own people

in the true faith concerning baptism, as also in delivering our Baptist friends from their fundamental error, and in setting them in better harmony with the great body of the Christian church. It is to be hoped therefore that all will give our production a thorough and impartial examination.

Lest any one might doubt the want of harmony among Baptist writers on these important words, *baptizo* and *bapto*, we will give a few extracts from their writings, as furnished by James W. Dale, D. D.

Roger Williams says: "*Baptizo* means to *dip*, and nothing but dip."

Dr. Gale: "Dipping only is baptism."

Abraham Booth: "The primary sense of *baptizo* is to dip."

Dr. Cox: "The idea of dipping is in every instance." Again, "Plunging is the unquestionable, settled, and universally admitted primitive signification."

Dr. Carson: "My position is that *baptizo* always signifies to *dip*; never expressing anything but mode." "To dip or immerse." "It never means to dye."

Dr. Fuller: "Dip, sink, plunge, immerse."

Prof. Ripley: "To dip is its radical, proper meaning."

Prof. Dagg: "*Baptizo* signifies the immersion which attends drowning or sinking of ships." He thus confesses that "the sentiment," that *dip* expounds *baptizo*, must in the face of Greek usage be

utterly abandoned. *Baptizo*, in more than fifty cases examined by this learned professor, was found invariably to express the *condition* or state effected by drowning or sinking. *Bapto*, in fifty cases examined, he found to mean to *dip*. He gives the uniform translation of *bapto*, to dip, while he never translates *baptizo*, in a single instance, to *dip*. Had this gentleman pressed his investigation a little further, he would have discovered that *baptizo* and *bapto* are two radically different words in Greek usage. So Dr. Dale.

M. J. Jewett: "To dip or immerse, and never has any other meaning."

Baptist Confession of Faith: "Plunging is the way and manner of dispensing this ordinance taught in the Scriptures."

In all these definitions of *baptizo*, except that of Prof. Dagg, the word is regarded as expressing a definite act, and that act expressed by dipping or plunging. But by and by the Baptist writers show us that they stand in doubt as to their position that baptism means dipping, and nothing but dipping. Accordingly we find them starting out with a new definition. Dr. Gale: "The word *baptizo*, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under the water, as in general a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it." With this Dr. Morell agrees, where he says: "That the word *baptizo* uniformly signifies to *dip* I will not

venture to assert, nor undertake to prove." Dr. Cox comes over to the same side, and says, "A person may be immersed by pouring; but the immersion is being plunged into water or overwhelmed by it." With this Drs. Fuller and Morell agree: "A person may be baptized, immersed, by pouring."

Dr. Conant says that *baptizo* has but one meaning, and that meaning is an expressed act, a definite act characterized by passing from one medium into another; and it is distinctly expressed by *plunge*. This position, he contradicts by and by, where he says, "The word *baptizein*, by constant usage, expressed an entire submersion of the object. A sense founded in the idea of a total submergence, as in floods of sorrow. We speak of a man as immersed in calamity, etc., always with the idea of totality, of being wholly under the dominion of those *states* or influences."

Here is an irreconcilable contradiction. In one case he says that baptism is an expressed *act*, and in the other, a *state* or condition. But the same word cannot express both *act* and *condition*, although act and condition may be inseparably united in one word. To *plunge*, for instance, expresses directly the nature of the act which may carry into and under water, while *swamp* expresses nothing, directly of the nature of the act which carries its object under water, but gives expression to the condition effected, whatever may have been the nature of the act.

Notwithstanding all this, Dr. Conant gives, in his translations, according to Dr. Dale, no less than

forty acts by which baptism was effected, viz., "To assault, to let down, to flow, to fall, to weigh down, to walk, to pierce, to hurl down, to march, to rush down, to surround, to press down, to rise above, to dip, to submerge, to thrust, to blow, to rush down, to strike, to proceed, to sink, to immerge, to imbathe, to plunge, to lower down, to immerse, to come on, to overturn, to boil up, to flood, to overwhelm, to let down, to enter in, to pour, to souse, to bring down, to depress, to steep, to drench, to play the dipping match, and to duck." In view of all these definitions, what becomes of the position that *baptizo* means *dip*, and nothing but *dip*?

Baptizo, being a word of varied usage, is never confined to any specific act, but whatever act or influence is capable of thoroughly changing the character, state, or condition of an object, is capable of baptizing that object, and by such change of character, state, or condition, assimilating that condition to itself, does in fact baptize it.

The word has a well marked *primary* and *secondary* usage in all Greek literature. In its primary use it means to place an object in a sunken state or condition within a fluid element, without making any provision for the return of that object out of the element in which it is thus sunk or baptized. In its primary usage, therefore, except by way of figure, *baptizo* could never be employed in ritual baptism. But this point will be further illustrated by Scripture examples.

In this respect, *immerse*, in its *primary* Latin signification, is a translation of the *primary* Greek signification of *baptizo*. For the word *immerse* comes from the Latin *in* and *mergo*, the *in* being changed into *im* for the sake of euphony. But as *in* does of itself express simply in-ness of position, so it does also in composition. And it must in no case be assumed that when *in* appears in composition with a word, it thereby renders that word one of action. We deny therefore that *in*, as appearing in *im-mergo* or *im-merse*, expresses of itself movement, or that it indicates that *mergo* or *merse* has any such character. On the contrary, we contend that *in* compounded with *mergo* or *merse*, expresses merely position, and serves to express with emphasis the idea of in-ness, which is the leading character of the word with which it is associated.

Ovid speaks of a house as *mersed*, and boats sailing over it. This house was not plunged or dipped into the water, but was *mersed* by the water rising above it. Pliny speaks of a river being *mersed* into another. This was not by the act of dipping into, but by the act of flowing. Will it therefore be said that *mergo* means to flow? The act of flowing, by which the *mersion* was effected, is wholly distinct from *mergo*, although no distinct word is employed to express the action. The *mersion* follows on the flowing.

Thus Virgil (*Æneid*, Lib. III., 605,) also uses the word, where he says: "Spargite me in fluctus, vas-

toque immergite ponto." Translated it reads thus: "Cast me into the waves, and immerse (sink) me in the deep sea." Here the action by which the mer-sion is effected is stated to be "*casting*;" the mer-sion following as a consequence. Had "*immergite*" been used alone, it would not have meant to cast, to dip, to plunge, but the condition would be expressed, which would of necessity carry with it some adequate form of act left unexpressed.

This is the classical use of the word *immerse* (*sink*), and therefore it cannot be allowed to be used as synonymous with *dip* in this controversy. *In*, compounded with bury, in-bury, in-tomb, has as little power to change the character of the word as *in* has in *immerse*. It only emphasizes the in-ness of condition. The same is true of *in* joined with *mergo*; and when our Baptist friends take occasion, from the use at times of the Latin preposition to denote motion, to engraft this idea on *immergo*, or *immerse*, they do what is incapable of justification. It is, however, on this ground (and failing to supply the exact verb) that the meaning, *dip*, *plunge*, has been erroneously attributed to this word, with some appearance of truth (especially to the illiterate); while its true nature and proper usage allowed it to be used in cases where dip and plunge were inadmissible. Therefore dip and plunge have been used where they could be, immerse has been used where it must be, with the assumption that it was a kindred word with them and expressive of act and movement.

This duplicity of using *immerse* and *dip* as synonymous words must be abated, checked, even though it should cost our Baptist friends the very serious and painful loss of dipping as a divine command.

Bapto, to dip, has, however, nothing to do in this controversy; for the Holy Ghost has not once employed that word to express the ordinance of baptism, and no one can show us a single instance, in the New Testament or in the Greek and Latin Fathers, where that word has ever been employed for such a purpose. Why then do our Baptist friends introduce into this controversy a word which the Holy Ghost has never employed? Where do they get the right to change the Scriptures, or to read into *baptizo* the meaning of *bapto*? We deny that any one has the right to change the word of God. But have not our Baptist friends committed this error in confounding *baptizo*, the word always used by the Holy Ghost in speaking of the ordinance of baptism, with *bapto*, which belongs to another family of words? All Greek writers refuse to interchange *baptizo* and *bapto*, or to interchange *bapto* in a single instance with *baptizo* in speaking of Christian baptism. If these two words mean the same thing, if they mean to put into a fluid element and to withdraw, is it not marvelous that the Holy Ghost has never, in a single instance, in speaking of Christian baptism, used them interchangeably? Is it therefore becoming for those who are very zealous for the Holy Spirit to substitute another word for that which the Holy

Ghost teacheth? or, retaining the form of the word, to supplement it by using the meaning of a rejected word? But this very thing is done by the Baptists, who substitute *bapto* for *baptizo*, or who give the latter word the meaning of the former.

But *bapto*, notwithstanding the teachings of the Baptists to the contrary, has some other meanings beside *dip*. It means also to wet, to moisten, to wash, to dye, to stain, to smear, to gild, to temper, to imbue. Following the order of the definitions here given, we also present the reader with an example of each from some Greek author, faithfully translated: Theocritus speaks of "dipping honey with a pitcher." Suidas, "Wetting the hollow of his hand, he sprinkles the judgment-seat." Aristotle, "Being pressed it moistens (*baptci*) and colors the hand." "*Bapsai* the poet has called to *moisten*." Aratus, "Washed his head and shoulders with water of the river." Aristophanes, "They wash with warm water." "The lake was dyed with blood." The lake was not dipped in blood. Sophocles, "It is well that thou hast *stained* thy sword with the army of the Greeks." "Smeared with frog-colored washes." "Having gilded poverty thou hast appeared rich." "*Temperers* of brass." "To lose temper." "Imbued with integrity to the bottom." Examples from Dr. Dale.

From all this it is evident that even *bapto* does not always mean to *dip*, and therefore even according to the Baptist position neither does *baptizo* always mean

32597

234.161

B4996

to dip. And if our Baptist friends have a right from *bapto* to read into *baptizo*, to *dip*, we have an equal right from *bapto* to read into *baptizo*, to moisten, to sprinkle, to wash, etc. But we are satisfied, in this controversy, to use the word which the Holy Ghost invariably employs.

Baptizo and *bapto* are therefore two clearly defined, distinct, and radical words, both in their classic and Scripture usage. Of this we have already a clear hint by Prof. Dagg, who always translates *baptizo* as a verb expressing condition or state, and *bapto* by dip. Why is this? It is not of accident, nor because he regarded the different words employed as of the same value, nor because it was a matter of indifference to the system which he advocated; for the Baptist system lives or dies as dip does or does not represent *baptizo*. Why then such a translation? The only answer that can be given is that Prof. Dagg thus confesses that "the sentiment" that *dip* expounds *baptizo* must, in the face of Greek usage, be utterly abandoned. Toward this Dr. Conant also leans heavily, although his prejudice in favor of the Baptist theory will not allow him to go too far in that direction.

Therefore the primary meaning of *baptizo*, according to its classical use, is to *sink*, or *immerse*, using the latter word in its primary Latin signification, *in* and *mergo*, which does not mean to *dip* or *plunge*; nor does it express any definite act, nor yet act or movement undefined in character; but it expresses

condition characterized by in-ness of position, commonly within a fluid element, which condition may be effected by any act competent thereto. In this respect *baptizo* and *mergo* are used alike in their respective languages. But the word *immerse*, in modern parlance, being often associated with the word *dip*, has acquired the popular idea of putting something into a fluid element and withdrawing it. This makes *immerse* a verb of double action like *dip*; which usage is entirely foreign to its Latin signification, in which like *sink* it expresses condition or state, the result of action. *Immerse*, in its ancient Latin derivatives, only approximates the meaning of *baptizo* in its primary sense, but there is no English word which precisely expresses the varied signification of *baptizo*. At the time our Authorized Version was made, *baptizo* was as much in dispute as it is now. The translators therefore anglicized the word, but did not presume to fix a single meaning to the word in the original Greek.

But what do the best lexicographers and the best theologians say of this word *baptizo*?

The position assumed by Baptists generally is that *baptizo* denotes the specific act of *dipping* only. In this position it is assumed that the lexicographers are generally with them.

Shoetgen defines *baptizo* by the Latin "*mergo, immergo, abluo, lavo, largiter profundo.*" These words translated read to *merse*, to *immerse*, to *purify*, to *wash*, to *pour copiously*. Here the primary

signification is to *merse*, which means to sink to the bottom, and to leave there; the secondary, to *wash* by pouring copiously.

Passow defines the word, "often and repeatedly to dip in, to dip under, therefore to moisten, to dampen, to sprinkle."

Parkhurst defines *baptizo*, "to immerse, to plunge, to wash one's self, be washed, wash; to baptize, to wash in or with water in token of purification from sin and from spiritual pollution; to baptize as with cloud and sea; baptized (not *unto* Moses, as our English Authorized Version has it, but) *into* Moses, *i. e.*, with the covenant, etc.; unto Christ, etc."

Ewing's Greek Lexicon thus classifies its meaning: "1. I plunge or sink completely under water. 2. I cover partially with water. 3. I overwhelm or cover with water by rushing, flowing; or pouring upon. 4. I drench or impregnate with liquor by affusion; I pour abundantly upon, so as to wet thoroughly; I infuse. 5. I oppress or overwhelm by bringing burdens, afflictions, or distress upon. 6. *I wash, in general.* 7. *I wash for the special purpose of symbolical, ritual or ceremonial purification.* 8. I administer the ordinance of Christian baptism; I baptize."

Hesychius, who lived in the fourth century, assigns to *baptizo* but one general meaning, and that he finds in the word "*antleo*, which signifies to *draw*, or *pump*, or *pour out water*." Alas! what has become of dipping and nothing but dip? This has no

reference whatever to immerse. Hesychius would thus make the baptism of water correspond to the thing signified, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, who was poured out upon the disciples.

Ursinus defines it by "*abluo, aspergo*," that is, "to *wash*, to *sprinkle*."

Scapula defines *baptizo*, "Mergo seu immergo, item submergo, item abluo, lavo." That is, being interpreted, sink or immerge, also submerge, also to remove filth by washing, to wash away, to cleanse or purify, to wash. Here to *sink*, to *immerge*, to *submerge*, express the primary use of *baptizo*, while to cleanse, to wash, express the secondary, which we will see is the Scripture meaning, and the only sense in which it can be used in ritual baptism. Scapula therefore does not uphold the position that *baptizo* denotes nothing else but the specific act of dipping; that is, to put into a fluid and withdraw. There is no withdrawing or emerging from the fluid element what is put therein.

But why take up more time in quoting more lexicons which we have at hand to prove that *baptizo* has a classical or scriptural meaning, or a primary and secondary, the first to sink to the bottom and to leave there, and the second to wash for ceremonial purification, when Dr. Carson, a distinguished Baptist, acknowledges that all the lexicographers and commentators are against the Baptist position that *baptizo* means *dip* and nothing but *dip*? The following is Dr. Carson's humble confession on this point:

“ My position is, that *baptizo* always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons. Many may be startled at the idea of refusing to submit to the unanimous authority of lexicons as an instance of the boldest skepticism. Are lexicons, it may be asked, of no authority? Now, I admit that lexicons are an authority, but they are not an *ultimate authority*. Lexicographers have been guided by their own judgment in examining the various passages in which the word occurs; and it is still competent for every man to have recourse to the same sources. The meaning of the word must be determined by an actual inspection of the passages in which it occurs, as often as any one chooses to dispute the judgment of the lexicographers.”

Dr. Carson, therefore, admits that the Baptist position cannot be proved from the lexicons and the commentators, that *baptizo* means to *dip* and nothing but dip. He appeals to the classics. Therefore to the classics let us follow him. What then is the primary use of *baptizo* in the classics? We give some examples from the Classic Baptism of Dr. Dale, who is said to have examined every passage in the classics bearing on this much-disputed word.

Aristotle: “ They say that the Phœnicians inhabiting the region called Gadira, sailing beyond the Pillars of Hercules, with an easterly wind, four days,

reach certain desert places full of rush and seaweeds; which when it is ebb tide are not (*baptizesthai*) mersed; but when it is full tide are flooded." From this it is evident that Aristotle did not use the word *baptizo* in its modern Baptist sense, to *dip*, but in the sense of permanent condition or state. The rush and seaweeds were stationary on the seacoast, and were only baptized when the tide flowed over them, and only as long as they remained in that state or condition were they said to be baptized. This example changes the whole face of the controversy, and shows the absurdity of endeavoring to make ritual baptism to conform to the primary use of the word. This must be sought and can only be found in the secondary, as will be made to appear when we come to discuss that point. We see therefore from this example that it is not true, according to Aristotle, who wrote classic Greek, that *baptizo* means to *dip* and nothing else—expressing the specific act of dipping and denoting nothing but mode.

Plutarch: "And dying they filled the lake with dead bodies; so that to the present day many barbaric arrows, and helmets, and pieces of iron breast-plates and swords, *mersed* in the marshes, are found."

Here is a condition of baptism in which these weapons and pieces of armor are found after the lapse of a long series of years. It will require Carson to rise from the dead to pronounce this a case of dipping. His mantle has fallen on no living man.

All these bows, helmets, breastplates, swords, were equally *baptized*. But where is the dipping in this example? The long repose of these relics in a state of baptism at the bottom of the marshes, in which they lay buried for ages, casts shame on the whole Baptist theory, which endeavors to make ritual baptism conform with the primary, and not the secondary use of the Greek word *baptizo*. We will never come to the truth of this word by seeking it in the heathen classics. Its true use and meaning must be sought in the New Testament Greek.

Many more examples of the primary use of *baptizo* are furnished and at hand in Dr. Dale's *Classic Baptism*, but these which have been here given are sufficient to illustrate the primary classical meaning and use of *baptizo*. From these it is evident that *baptizo*, in the Greek classics, does not mean primarily to *dip*, that is, to put into a fluid element and to withdraw, but that it means a permanent state or condition of an object in a fluid element, without regard to mode or duration.

But there is also a secondary use of *baptizo* in classic writers. Words are continually changing from a primary to a secondary use, which ultimately takes the place of the primary. Take for instance the word *prevent*. Formerly it meant *to go before*; now it means to *hinder*. *Let* formerly meant to *hinder*; now it means to *permit*. Dr. Carson admits that the secondary may become the primary. And he says that the secondary is just as *literal* as the

primary. So with *baptizo* in ritual baptism; it has ceased to be a heathen, and it has become a Christian. The secondary use of *baptizo* has already made its appearance in classic writers.

Æsop says: "And baptizing the tow with oil, binding it to her tail, he set it on fire." This is told of a fox that had been caught, and was thus punished for mischief done. Dipping is not allowed in the case; for we have the dative without the preposition, which here denotes instrumentality.

Heliodorus: "When midnight had baptized the city with sleep." Where is the dipping in this case?

Libanius: "He exhorts the class of breadmakers to be more just, but he did not think it proper to use compulsion, fearing the running away of the masses; by which the city would immediately be baptized, just as a ship, the sailors having deserted it." Where is the dipping in this case—either in figure or in fact?

CHAPTER V.

LUTHER NO IMMERSIONIST.

BAPTISTS sometimes quote Luther as an immersionist. It is certainly a source of gratification to us that Luther is so well received by them. If they would only lay more stress on Justification by Faith, as Luther taught it, we would be better satisfied with our Baptist friends. The passage quoted to prove the charge is a letter giving an account of the baptism of a converted Jewess. We quote from Dr. Krauth:

1. The passage referred to is a letter from Luther written from Coburg, July 9, 1530, in reply to an Evangelical pastor, Henry Genesius, who had consulted him in regard to the baptism of a Jewish girl. This occurred after issue of the Catechism in which it is pretended that he taught baptism by dipping.

2. The letter is given in Walch and also in the Leipsic edition (xxii., 37), and is not, however, the original, but a translation; and that from a defective copy of the original. The original letter is given in the De Wette's Luther's Briefe (iv., 80), and contains a most important sentence, which is not found in the German translation. The letter in Walch

cannot therefore be cited in evidence, for it is neither the original nor a reliable translation of it.

3. The whole letter shows that the main point of inquiry was not as to whether she would be baptized in this or that mode, but what precaution decency demanded during the baptism.

4. Luther says in his letter, “ *It would please me therefore that she should stand and modestly have the water poured upon her (mihi placeret, verecunde perfunditur)* ; or sitting in the water up to her neck, her head should be immersed with a trine immersion.” This mode doubtless refers to the Jewish custom of immersion, according to which the candidate sits in water up to the neck, and then certain portions of the law are read to him or her. It refers to the Jewish mode in the days of Luther, and not to the Bible mode.

5. An immersionist is one who contends that baptism *must* be by immersion. The passage quoted is decisive that Luther did not think that baptism *must* be by immersion. He represents it pleasing to him, either that the girl should have the water applied by pouring, or if she be immersed, she should sit in the water up to her neck, and that her head should be immersed. Greater precautions, for the sake of decency, should be observed than were usual in the Church of Rome. It is demonstrated by this very letter that *Luther was not an immersionist*.

6. In suggesting the modes of baptism, Luther was simply following the ritual of the Romish church.

In the Roman ritual the direction is: "Baptism may be performed either by pouring, immersion, or sprinkling; but either the first or second modes, which are most in use, shall be retained according as it has been the usage of the churches to employ the one or the other, so that either the head of the person to be baptized shall have a trine ablution," *i. e.*, either water shall be poured upon it, or the head shall be immersed. Luther again quotes almost *verbatim*.

In the Romish ritual, furthermore, for the baptism of adults, it is said: "But in the church when baptism is performed by immersion, either of the entire body or the head only, the priest shall baptize by thrice immersing his head or person. Luther directed, in case the Jewess was immersed at all, that the officiating minister should immerse her head only. She was to seat herself in the bath, and the only religious immersion was not that of the whole body (as Rome permits, and the Baptist, if consistent, would prescribe), but of her head only. Luther, so far as he approved of immersion, was not as much of an immersionist as the ritual of Rome might have made him; for he does not hint at the immersion of the whole body by the minister. An immersionist contends that the whole body must be submerged, even to the extent thereof to which he allowed immersion. Luther was not an immersionist.

7. If Luther could be proved an immersionist from this letter, it would be demonstrated that he

derived his views from the Romish church, and held it in common with her. In like manner the Church of England (the Episcopal church) would be carried over to the ranks of immersionists; for they allow the different modes. Luther was not an immersionist.

8. Whatever Luther's personal preference may have been as to the mode, he never doubted the validity of baptism by pouring. But immersionists do not merely doubt it; they absolutely deny it. Therefore, Luther was not an immersionist.

9. An immersionist is one who makes his peculiar mode of baptism a term of church communion and an article of faith. Luther was in a church which did not prescribe immersion as necessary, and never made it an article of faith. Therefore, Luther was not an immersionist.

10. Luther's translation of the words connected with baptism prove that he was not an immersionist. So far Dr. Krauth.

Luther is often quoted by Baptists as giving the meaning of *bapto*, to *dip*, to *baptizo*. From this it is made out that Luther was an immersionist. Luther, in 1519, while he was yet under Romish errors, in regard to this as well as other subjects, and before he had thoroughly studied the word of God, and before he had translated the Scriptures into the German language, when he entirely changed his views as to the mode of baptism, from dipping to pouring, said: "Die Tauf heist auf Griechisch *Baptismos*, zu

Latein *mersio* das ist wenn man etwas ganz ins Wasser tauchet," etc. Baptism is called in Greek *Baptismos*, in Latin, *Mersio*, that is, when anything is wholly steeped into water, so as to be overwhelmed. And although, in many places, it is no more the custom to plunge and steep the children into the baptismal font, yet it would be right, according to the etymology of the word *Tauf*, wholly to sink the child or person baptized into the font, and again to withdraw; for without doubt in the German language the word *Tauf* is derived from the word *Tief*, "that what is baptized be sunk deep into the water," etc.

These were Luther's views of the mode of baptism in 1519, only two years after he had written his Ninety-Five Theses, and while he was yet a Romish priest, and a member of the Romish church, which directed that baptism should be administered either by pouring, immersion, or sprinkling. The sermon from which this passage is taken was written five years before he commenced his translation of the New Testament, and more than twenty years before he gave his Bible its final revision. In his Bible he never in a single instance translates *baptizo* by dip; and in his liturgy he directs that baptism should be performed by *pouring* the water. But even in the passage quoted, Luther gives only the etymology, that is, the primary meaning of the word *baptizo*, to sink, to overwhelm, etc. This we have all along admitted to be the primary use of the word; but it is not its secondary or ritual use, as Luther also admits.

Dr. Dale, in his great work on Baptism, on which he spent the greater part of his ministerial life, having examined every classical text in which the Greek word *baptizo* is found, shows most conclusively and overwhelmingly that *baptizo* does not refer to mode whatever, but “*expresses any complete change of condition by whatever agency effected, or in whatever way applied.*” He also says that through daily and long continued use, *baptizo* has secured in the classics a secondary use, conveying an idea derived, but dissociated, from the primary use, which gives it a *status* of its own without recurring to the source whence it sprang.

Whence then do Baptists get this double action, expressed by dipping, into the word *baptizo*? They get it from the word *bapto*, which they say is the root of *baptizo*. Well then, let us take the word *bapto*, with which our friends endeavor to make out their case, and let us show where that word belongs in this controversy. The word *bapto* means “to dip, to moisten, to wash, to dye, to stain, to paint, to gild, to temper, to tincture,” etc. It has, as you perceive, a great many significations; but to *dip* is its primary one. Now, they take the meaning of *bapto*, a radically different word from *baptizo*, and read the meaning of the former into the latter, and come therefore to the conclusion that *baptizo* means dipping also, because *bapto* does. Is this honest? The word *bapto* is an intruder in the domain of *baptizo*, and as such it should be unceremoniously dismissed.

What right have our Baptist friends to introduce into this controversy a word which is never employed by the Holy Ghost in speaking of the ordinance of baptism? *Baptizo* is the only word employed whenever the sacrament of baptism is mentioned in the New Testament Scriptures, and therefore that is the only word which demands our attention. *Bapto* is therefore rejected, because the Holy Ghost has never made use of this word in the numerous passages in which He speaks of the ordinance of baptism. The ritual baptism of the New Testament is no dipping baptism, as we shall see when we come to study *baptizo* from a New Testament point of view.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SCRIPTURE USAGE OF BAPTIZO.

OUR Baptist friends say that this word means to dip and nothing else. This position we have found unsustained by the classics. But they contend that in the Scriptures it also means to *dip* and nothing but dip. Therefore "to the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." The question therefore is, "Do the Scriptures use the word *baptizo* in the sense of dip and nothing else?" The Baptists say they do; we will prove they do not.

Before entering, however, on the proof, we wish to call the attention of our readers to the fact that the Greek of the New Testament is not classic Greek, and its words are often used in a technical sense. From this fact there arises an element of diction peculiar to Christianity. When the gospel commenced to be preached, the Greek language was almost universal, and that language was adopted by providence through which to convey the rich treasures of grace to the common people. In this way the Greek language has become, as it were, Christianized. The sacred use and the classical use are often very different.

So with the word *baptizo* in the Scriptures; it has lost its *primary*, except by way of figure, and is used altogether in its *secondary* sense.

Schoetgen, as we have already seen, defines *baptizo* by "*mergo*," to *sink*, and "*largiter profundo*." Here *mergo* is the *primary*, and *largiter profundo*, copiously pouring, the *secondary*. All these terms have been noticed except *largiter profundo*, copiously pouring. *Baptizo*, therefore, according to Schoetgen, means *copiously pouring*. Is it ever so used in speaking of ritual baptism? The three copious overpourings of water on Elijah's altar on Mount Carmel are spoken of by Origen, Basil Magnus, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, as a type of Christian baptism. On this passage, 1 Kings xviii. 32-38, Ambrose says: "Elias showed a type of baptism, and opened heaven, which had been shut three years and six months. For no one can ascend into the kingdom of heaven except by water and the Spirit." This illustration strikes a fatal blow at the Baptist theory, that baptism is nothing else but dipping. There was surely no dipping on Elijah's altar on Mount Carmel. The water was poured copiously upon the altar three times, and this the church fathers have called a type of Christian baptism.

Canon says, in reference to the murder of Alexander: "Thebe exhorted to the murder, and having baptized and put to sleep Alexander by much wine, she dismissed the guards of the bedchamber under pretext of using the bath, and called the brothers to

work." Does this mean that Thebe dipped Alexander in wine, and then having put him to sleep, called the murderers to their bloody work? No, no; Alexander *poured* the wine *copiously* down his throat, like a drunkard as he was; and thus being under the influence of wine, put into a drunken condition or state, he was an easy subject for his murderers. The classics and the Scriptures are full of this secondary meaning of *baptizo*, to pour copiously. Does not also St. Paul allude to this thought, Eph. v. 18, where he says: "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit"? "Baptized with wine" is a familiar thought in the Greek classics.

Hesychius, who lived in the fourth century, as we have already seen, assigns to *baptizo* but one general meaning, and that he finds in the word *antleo*, which signifies to *pump water*, or to *draw water*, and to *pour it into a vessel*. This would make *baptizo* to mean *copiously pouring*. As water in baptism is poured out upon the baptized, as from one vessel into another, so the Holy Spirit is poured out upon him who believes in Jesus. "In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," Eph. i. 13. We have many Scripture illustrations of this definition of *baptizo*, as copiously pouring. "I will pour out my Spirit unto you," Prov. i. 23. "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," Joel ii. 28; Acts iii. 17, 18. "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the

dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring," Is. xlv. 3.

Luther, in the German Bible, always translates *baptizo* by the word *taufen*, which means to *baptize*, leaving the mode undefined. *Tunken* means to *dip*, but this corresponds with the Greek *bapto*, which is used in no passage of Scripture where the ordinance of baptism is mentioned. See Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38. In these and other places he translates *baptizo* to *wash*. In 1523, Luther issued his own directions for baptism: "*Wie man recht und verständlich einen Menschen zum Christen-glauben taufen soll.*" In these directions Luther says: "The person baptizing *pours the water* (geusst Wasser auf), and says, "*Ego baptizo te,*" that is in German, "Ich tauf dich" (I baptize thee). *Pouring* alone, and pouring copiously, is described by Luther as baptism. And in his Larger Catechism Luther says: "*Dass du lässtest das Wasser über dich giessen.*" Literally translated, "That thou lettest the water pour copiously over thee." Again: "*Was sollt ein Hand voll Wassers der Seelen helfen?*" What can a handful of water help the soul? This shows that "the handful of water" was connected with a received mode at that time in the Lutheran church.

Let us now turn to Heb. ix. 10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (divers *baptismois, baptisms*)." If you turn to Numbers xix. 18, 19, you will find the following: "And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and

sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave: and the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day: and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even." Here the use of water by *sprinkling*, *washing*, and *bathing* are called divers *baptisms* in Greek.

In St. Mark vii. 4, we read: "When the Pharisees come from the market, except they wash (*baptizontai*, *baptize themselves*), they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (*baptismous*) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables (*klinon*, *beds*)." It was certainly the custom of the Jews to wash their hands before dinner (Luke xi. 38); but what author of any standing, or minister of any judgment, ever contended that they entirely immersed themselves in water before every meal after they had returned from market? Yet this application of water, which was poured upon their hands, to a very small part of their body, is called baptism. The cups and pots they might have dipped in water, yet of this we are not certain, and it was contrary to the Jewish mode of ceremonial purification, which we have already proved was done by sprinkling or pouring. But will it be contended that the beds or couches, on which they reclined at their meals, were carried to some

stream or river and dipped? Or that every Pharisee had a cistern provided in his yard for this purpose? But to dip in stagnant water would defile more and more. It is therefore evident that many of the purifications, termed *baptisms*, were performed by sprinkling or pouring; while it is not *certain* that they were performed by dipping in a single case.

We here reiterate the proposition or truth, mentioned before, that the words of the Bible must be interpreted according to the meaning which the sacred writers attached to them. When we read a book, and desire to understand its author, we must interpret his words by the sense in which he employs them. We are not permitted to read an obsolete meaning into his words when he uses them in another well-received sense. So with the word *baptizo*. It has two distinct meanings; a classical and a scriptural; or a primary and a secondary. In the old classics it means to *sink* something to the bottom in a fluid element, and to leave it there, there being nothing in the word to bring up that which was sunk to the bottom. The Baptists bring the double action into the word through *bapto*, which is never employed by the Holy Ghost in the ordinance of baptism. In the description of this sacrament He always uses *baptizo*.

The scriptural or secondary meaning of *baptizo*, *to baptize*, means to wash for ceremonial purification, which was well understood by the Jews to be done by pouring or sprinkling.

In the passages quoted above, we see that the word *wash* in our Authorized Version is in the Greek *baptizo*—except they baptize themselves they eat not. And what did they baptize? They baptized themselves, their cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and beds, or couches on which they reclined by their tables. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Pharisees and all the Jews, whenever they came home from market, where they had come in contact with the people, and thus had become defiled, as they supposed and as they were taught by their traditionalism, would immerse themselves in water, and also their cups, and their pots, and their brazen vessels, and their reclining couches, before they would eat their meals? The matter is reduced to an absurdity. It is therefore evident to the common reader from the narrative itself, that they washed or baptized for ceremonial purification, which was done by the Jews by pouring or sprinkling.

That the word *wash* or *baptize* is used in our text under consideration in the sense of washing for ceremonial purification, is evident from verse 3, which reads: "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash (*nipsontai*) their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders." *Nipto*, in the Greek, means "to wet, to wash the face, hands, feet," etc., and differs from *Luo*, "to wash the whole body, to bathe."

And by this word *nipto*, we also get at another meaning of the word *baptizo*, as used in this connec-

tion. It means not only to wash for ceremonial purification, but it also means to wash ceremonially a part of the body, for the whole body. That is, if a part of the body is washed for ceremonial purification, the whole body is ceremonially pure. Let us not forget this point; for it will serve us a good turn in this discussion of the mode of baptism. If the head is baptized, the whole man is baptized. If a drop of water mingled with heifer ashes fell upon the ceremonially unclean, he became ceremonially clean.

Now, let me prove to you that the Jews washed or baptized for ceremonial purification by pouring or sprinkling, and that *baptizo* was so understood by Christ and His disciples. We say that Christ and His contemporaries understood and used the word *baptizo* in the sense of washing for ceremonial purification by pouring or sprinkling. Besides Mark vii. 1-8, we have also Luke xi. 37-41. It is written in the law, "That the testimony of two men is true." Luke says of the same subject: "And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down with him to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed (*katharizete*) before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness." Compare John i. 25 with John iii. 25. *Baptizo* in the former is used in the same sense with

katharizo, to *purify*, in the latter. John the Evangelist here uses the word *baptizo* in the sense of *katharizo*, to wash for ceremonial purification, which we have over and over proved was performed by pouring or sprinkling.

Christ's commission to His disciples reads thus: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Now, how did the apostles understand the word *baptizo* in the commission? Did they understand it in the old classical sense, to sink to the bottom, and to leave there, or did they understand it in the sense of to wash for ceremonial purification, which they well knew from their Jewish customs was performed by pouring or sprinkling? Their own practice and teaching, as found in the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles, must ultimately decide this question.

The controversy, then, between Baptists and Pædobaptists refers to the subjects and the mode of baptism. The former hold that adult believers only are to be baptized, and that dipping is the only valid mode of baptism; the latter maintain that children of believing parents may and ought to be baptized, and that baptism may be administered by pouring or sprinkling as well as by dipping.

In 1 Cor. x. 1-2, we read: "Moreover, brethren,

I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." This is a beautiful passage of Scripture. Look at the points presented to our view; the Israelites, the cloud, and the sea. The Lord made the sea *dry land*, and the waters were divided; and the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea on *dry ground*, and so passed through to the opposite shore. *Over* the Israelites and *between* them and the Egyptians was the Pillar of Cloud, the Shekinah, in which the Lord dwelt. "And it came to pass, that in the morning-watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot-wheels, that they drave them heavily; so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel; for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians." Thus protected by the sea and the cloud, the Israelites passed through, and were delivered from their enemies. This St. Paul calls a *baptism* into the Mosaic economy; in other words, a consecration to God's service. This whole transaction gives us an allegorical illustration of baptism. The Pillar of Cloud, or the Shekinah, over and between the Israelites and the Egyptians, represents the water in the baptism; and the Lord in the Pillar of Cloud, or Shekinah, represents the name of the Triune God in the baptismal formula. The Lord looked through the Pillar of Cloud, and by the manifestation of His glory confounded the

Egyptians; while the Israelites under His cheering light marched toward the promised rest. But you perceive that the baptism of the Israelites, *men*, *women*, and *children*, in the cloud and in the sea, was neither by immersion nor by dipping; for they passed over on *dry ground*. Whatever water came from this baptism, must have been by the spray blowing upon them. For in order to have been dipped into the cloud and into the sea, it would have been necessary for them to have been above the cloud and above the sea, and to have been let down and pulled out by some supernatural power; but the text tells us that the Israelites were under the cloud, and passed through the channel on dry ground. Here, therefore, we have a baptism without immersion or dipping. The *other* party were immersed, and sunk to the bottom like lead; but they have not been heard of since!

Let us now see how Christian baptism answers to this allegory. Christian baptism is a sacrament. But what is a sacrament? A sacrament is a symbol of grace. Christian baptism is therefore a symbol of grace. But where the symbol is, there is the grace offered. Just as the Pillar of Cloud and Jehovah dwelling in it constituted the Shekinah, so water and the word of God constituted the sacrament of baptism. But the Logos, the Word, the Dabar, was the Jehovah, who dwelled in the Pillar of Cloud, and who delivered or saved the Israelites from all their enemies. That word was made flesh, and

shekinized among us. He died for our sins, and was raised for our justification. He is now glorified, and has returned to us, and dwells with us in His word and sacraments. By the preaching of His word and the administration of His sacraments we may be cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and perfected in holiness; if we willingly, and prayerfully, and constantly use these means of grace. And just as the word of the Lord, looking through the Pillar of Cloud, confounded the Egyptians, so "the word of God is still quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Be assured that the *water* in baptism does not sanctify us; for without the word of God the water is mere water, and no baptism; but with the word of God it is a baptism, a merciful water of life, and a laver of regeneration in the Holy Ghost: as St. Paul says to Titus, iii. 5, 6: "According to His mercy hath He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost: which He hath shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Many of those very Israelites, although baptized unto Moses, perished in the wilderness, and never reached the promised land. Wherefore? Because, as St. Paul says, "The word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it."

Very intimately connected with the passage, which

we have just been discussing, is the one found in 1 Peter iii. 21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Baptism is here called an antitype of the flood; our salvation by baptism resembles Noah's salvation by water. The points of resemblance are the ark, Noah and his family in the ark, the water, and the Antediluvians. Noah and all his house were saved by the waters of the flood coming between him and the corrupt antediluvian world. The water bore up the ark and its contents, while the Antediluvians were overwhelmed by its billows. This is called a type of baptism. How is this? The answer to this question is found in the apostle's *negative* and *positive* definition of baptism.

Baptism is not the mere outward washing ("not the putting away of the filth of the flesh"); not requiring as much water in its administration, as is needed to wash a filthy body. Water, whether much or little, is merely the sign of the Holy Ghost, or Christ in His Spirit, whose presence in us and we in Him, as Noah and his family were in the ark by divine appointment, alone can separate us from our sins; so strikingly illustrated by the overthrow of the Antediluvians.

Hence, baptism does not depend on the quantity of water. How much stress some people lay upon the quantity of water for this baptism! They think

they are not baptized unless they are plunged into a flood of water. Even the water that saved Noah from the Antediluvians was poured upon the ark. Noah and his family were first put into the ark, and the Lord shut them in. Henceforth there was to be no further communication between them and the Antediluvians. "The same day were the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened." The water was poured upon the ark, and thus the Antediluvian sinners were washed away from Noah, and the new race, which started in Noah's family, was saved from the contaminating influences of the old world. All this is represented in ritual baptism, which is a spiritual washing. As St. Paul says, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." But St. Peter, who knew all about this subject, says that baptism is not mere outward washing; "it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." With this Luther's definition corresponds: "Baptism is not mere water; but it is that water which the ordinance of God enjoins, and which is connected with God's word."

Baptism is therefore *positively* the answer of a good conscience toward God. But who have a good

conscience toward God, but such as have by the regenerating grace of God been separated from the world, the flesh, and the devil? This regenerating, justifying and sanctifying Spirit in our hearts is the real baptism of Christ, which saves us, of which water is the outward sign.

But how can our Baptist friends get dipping out of this baptism of Noah and his family in the ark? When Noah and his family had entered the ark, and the Lord had shut the door, then the rains descended and the floods came. The ark and all its contents were baptized by the descending rain, which lasted forty days and forty nights, but they were neither immersed nor dipped. The Antediluvians were *immersed*, *sunk*, classically baptized, not by being plunged into the water and lifted out again, but by the overwhelming billows which rolled over them more terrifically than the full tide baptized the rush and sea-weeds of Aristotle. Baptism by dipping therefore can be gotten out of this passage only by an immense stretch of figure, by making the overwhelmed Antediluvians to represent our old man, and Noah saved in the ark our new man. But all this can certainly not be gotten out of *the mode* of baptism; but out of baptism itself, the grace of God, which will be proved more fully under another head. And even this idea of the figure employed the Baptists cannot get out of it unless they read the meaning of *bapto* into *baptizo*, which we cannot allow from the Scripture meaning and usage of the latter word.

Let us next turn to 1 Cor. xv. 29 : " Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" Some find in this passage an allusion to a practice of baptizing persons over the graves of martyrs or catechumens who died before baptism was administered. The Greek preposition, *huper*, *over*, would certainly favor this interpretation, which is the one that Luther followed, who has rendered the phrase, "for the dead," "*über den Todten.*" The words of Luther are: "They are baptized at the graves of the dead, in token of the dead that lay buried there, and *over whom* they that were baptized would rise again. As we also might administer baptism publicly in the common churchyard or burying place." But could baptism *over* the graves of martyrs be performed by dipping? Were their graves dug at the bottom of rivers? Who will answer?

CHAPTER VII.

PLACES WHERE BAPTISMS WERE PERFORMED.

COME we now to the places where baptisms were performed. By these our Baptist friends would prove that baptism is dipping and nothing else. Here we must again hear about John's baptism in Enon, and Philip and the Eunuch on the road between Jerusalem and Gaza. Let us briefly look at the topography of these places.

“John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there.” The Greek for “much water” is *many springs*. Enon abounded in *springs*, but not in rivers; for it was some distance from the Jordan. If it had been close to the Jordan, the Evangelist would hardly have called attention to the *much water there*. Modern travelers, however, have not yet succeeded in fixing the site of ancient Enon, and that whole region seems rather destitute of water. A few springs are pointed out to the traveler in that region, which were probably the *many springs* mentioned in the text.

How should therefore John's baptizing in Enon determine the mode of baptism in the Christian church? The ten thousands, who followed John, re-

quired an abundance of water for their subsistence; the springs would be well adapted for such purposes, but very unsuitable places for dipping.

Now for Philip and the Eunuch, the favorite passage of the Baptists. This passage of Scripture is often quoted to prove that dipping is the only valid mode of baptism. Acts viii. 38: "And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him." This was done between Jerusalem and Gaza. It was a desert country, where there was not much water. The Eunuch was returning from Jerusalem, where he had heard wonderful things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and he was reading the prophet Isaiah, to see whether those things were true according to the Scripture. "The place of Scripture which he read was this: He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb, dumb before his shearer, so he opened not his mouth: in his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." When Philip came to him, and was received into the chariot, the Eunuch asked him, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this?" Philip instructed him that it was Jesus the Son of God. Then having expressed his faith in the Son of God, the Eunuch desired to be baptized. "And as they went on their way they came to a certain water; and the Eunuch said, "See, *here* is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Now,

what idea did the Eunuch have of baptism, and whence did he get it? The Eunuch had just read this passage, which stands near the one quoted: "So shall He (the Messiah) sprinkle many nations," Is. lii. 15. He had therefore the Jewish mode of sprinkling for purification in his mind. When he thought of baptism, he thought of its administration by sprinkling.

Besides, the expression, "They came unto a certain water," proves nothing as to the quantity or depth of the water, and therefore nothing in favor of dipping. "EPI TI HUDOR," "*unto a certain water,*" may be as correctly, and even more so, translated *to some water*, or *to a little water*. "TI" has sometimes a diminutive sense, and so here. Again, in the phrase, "*See, here is water,*" the translators have supplied the words *here is*. This is known to the reader, because they are *italicized*. In the original, however, we have nothing more than "*Idou, hudor,*" "*See, water!*" This is the language of surprise; the Eunuch did not expect to find any water in that desert place. "*See, a little water!*" "what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Again, for the prepositions *into* and *out of* we could substitute *to* and *from*, without doing violence to the Greek text. Accordingly, Then "they went down (from the chariot) both *to* or *for* the water (the one as administrator and the other as candidate), both Philip and the Eunuch; and He baptized him. "And when they were come up *from* the water," etc. This is all the Greek demands.

Is there anything here said about being dipped under the water with face forward, three times, according to the faith and practice of the German Baptists, or once backwards according to the faith and practice of the English Baptists? Nothing at all about such modes.

Besides, if the phrase, "They went down both into the water," means to dip under the water, one was as deep *in* as the other. But this proves too much, therefore proves nothing, according to a rule in logic.

But the apostles baptized where there was not *much water*. Let me call your earnest attention to the more important passages bearing on this point.

In the Acts of the Apostles ii. 41, we read: "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Where and how were the "three thousand" baptized? It must have been performed, according to the nature of the case, as set forth in this passage, "the same day," at Jerusalem, where there was neither river nor creek. For at the time of Pentecost it was summer in Judea, rains were scarce, brooks dried up, and nothing remained near Jerusalem but the pool of Siloam, in which it would have been wholly impracticable to have dipped so vast a multitude, the same day, in the space of six hours, from nine till three o'clock, when the morning and evening prayers were had in the temple. Compare Acts ii. 15 with Acts iii. 1.

But suppose the morning services, on the day of Pentecost, were somewhat protracted, say from nine till twelve, a very short time indeed, considering the importance and the solemnity of the occasion, and at their close, the apostles with the "three thousand" converts, at once repaired to the pool of Siloam, whose waters were reached by a descent of more than twenty steps, is it reasonable to conclude that the apostles, with the seventy added, if need be, could have dipped so vast a multitude in the space of time remaining until the ninth hour, when the pious Jews, now become Christians, were wont to go up to the temple to pray? This is a point which is beset with wonderful difficulties, if dipping is required; but one very easily adjusted, if sprinkling or pouring was used.

It is therefore highly probable that the first converts to the gospel, on the founding of the Christian church, were not baptized by dipping, but by sprinkling or pouring.

Neither does the account of the first converts to Christianity among the Gentiles favor dipping (Acts x. 47).

While Peter preached the gospel to Cornelius and his household and to many others, who had assembled with them on the same occasion, "the Holy Ghost fell on all those who heard the word." Then Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" This implies that the

water was brought to these converts, with which they were baptized either by pouring or sprinkling. This example would be sufficient to establish the mode of baptism among all Gentile churches. The apostle Peter was evidently no immersionist.

We have now reached, in our discussion, the citadel of the Baptist system, which is the figurative use of the word, *baptizo*. It is sometimes compared to a *burying*, therefore it is settled by Baptists to mean *dip* and nothing but *dip*. The principal passage brought up to defend the figurative use of the word, is found in Rom. vi. 3-7, and reads thus: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin."

The only text in the New Testament strictly parallel with this is found in Col. ii. 11, 12, and reads: "In whom (Christ) also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with Him in baptism, wherein also

ye are raised with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead."

Let us take up these passages in the order quoted, and candidly investigate them, and abide by their teachings.

We turn back, then, to Rom. vi. 3-7. First, of what was the apostle speaking? Evidently of something well understood by the Romans. He was speaking about *sin* and *grace*, the two great points around which revolve all the teachings of the New Testament. In the preceding chapter we find this statement: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." "If so," says an objector to the apostle's doctrine, "may we not continue in sin, that grace may abound?" To this the apostle replies: "God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" He then goes on to show how this death to sin is effected. He says that our death to sin is effected by our being baptized into Jesus Christ—baptized into His death. How, then, are we baptized into Jesus Christ's death? Is it by water or by the Spirit? Who will answer? Let St. Paul himself answer, as he does in 1 Cor. xii. 13, where he says: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." And in the 27th verse of this same chapter, he also tells us who this *one body*, into which we have been baptized, is: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in

particular." We have the same instruction in Eph. i. 15-23; Gal. iii. 27; John iii. 5.

Therefore by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, by the regenerating, justifying, sanctifying grace of God, are we as Christians baptized into Jesus Christ, baptized into His death, into the merits of His death, which He suffered on the cross, to which He carried our sins in His own body. See Rom. viii. 34; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. ii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 21-24. These passages show that we are made partakers of the merits of Christ's death and sufferings by the power of the Spirit of God, who works faith in us through His word. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is really Christ's baptism; for He said to His disciples, "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." And John himself cried and said, "The same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."

For St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, which is implied in the passage of Scripture under consideration, requires not only that we believe in Christ Jesus as He is presented to us in the historical evidences, which go to establish in our minds the certainty of His death and resurrection, but also that we experience the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; the former as the *ground* of our justification, and the latter as the sure *token* of it, and as the *earnest* of our future inheritance. As the same apostle says of the Ephesians: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your

salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory." For the apostle teaches us, that we enter into the justified state before God by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the *token* by which we may assure our hearts of the fact, is the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given unto us. But the Spirit of God dwelling in us as Christians, the apostle shows further on in the Epistle, to be the Spirit of Christ, or Christ Himself. This Spirit is our life because of the righteousness into which He has baptized us. Hence, the passage: "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." This being the condition of the justified man, he is delivered from sin, the law, death, the divine wrath, and is made alive unto God, all which is predicated on what *Christ has become to us through faith*. This being dead to sin through the merits of Christ, while we are in this body of sin, is not to be taken in the sense of a personal righteousness at once grown up in the soul; but it is effected by and through the imputed righteousness of faith, which is secured by the power of the Holy Ghost through whom we are baptized into the death of Christ, and thus joined to Christ and associated with Him in a mysterious

manner in the merits of His death and resurrection; that we might thus both die in Him unto sin, and be made alive unto God through His glorified presence in our hearts.

The apostle compares this being dead to sin in Christ to a burial, in which the body of sin is destroyed. That is, all our sins, whether past, present, or future, are so sunk into oblivion by the baptism of the Spirit, that their sight is never again to be expected in all the ages of eternity. For he that is thus dead with Christ is freed from sin.

The inference therefore is that if we be thus dead with Christ; thus crucified with Him, and associated with Him in His death; as Christ came forth from that death unto sin, and was raised again by the glory of the Father, His presence in our hearts is the divine assurance, that we shall also live with Him in a glorified state forever. Our eternal life, our glorified state, is predicated on this death and union with Christ. "If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him." For the justified man is now, while he lives in this world, in a state of death with Christ as to the *old man*, with which he must be necessarily associated as long as he lives in this world.

With this explanation let us read the passage again: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up

from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." The passage in Col. ii. 11, 12, teaches substantially the same truth; but throws additional light upon the subject of the resurrection of the body.

Now, our Baptist friends seem to see in these passages an illustration of how ancient baptism was performed; because the baptism of the Spirit is in these compared with a burial. The dipping of the whole body into water, would therefore prefigure the death and burial of our old man; and the *emergence*, the lifting of the body out of water, would prefigure the resurrection of the new man. This is indeed a beautiful figure; and they say that the apostle must have had his mind's eye on baptism by dipping. Not at all, but there is mere allusion, by way of figure, to the *primary* signification of *baptizo*, to put into some permanent state or condition, which is not and cannot be illustrated by ritual or water baptism; but which is and must be effected by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. For the Scripture term *baptism* always includes both the symbol element and the Holy Ghost.

Therefore all those persons who are baptized into Christ by pouring or sprinkling are buried with Him in baptism, which is implied in the word "us" in the text. The word "us" here includes the writer of this epistle and the persons written to. The former was St. Paul, and the latter the church at Rome. How were these baptized? It cannot be

proven that they were baptized by dipping. We have an account of Paul's baptism in Acts ix. 17, 18, 19: "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized. And when he had received meat, he was strengthened." It is seen from the narrative that Paul was baptized in the house, the place where he had been lying sick and weak for three days. "He was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." According to the narrative he was first baptized, and then "he received meat, and was strengthened." He evidently did not leave the house until he was baptized and fed. His baptism must therefore have been by pouring or sprinkling, which was the mode of consecration.

So also with the baptism of the Roman Christians. Who founded the Church at Rome? It is highly probable that it was founded by the "strangers of Rome," who were present and converted among the "three thousand" on the day of Pentecost, and as soon as they had returned to Rome, they at once founded the Christian Church in that great city. On this point Conybeare and Howson give the following: "The name of the original founder of the

Roman Church has not been preserved to us by history, nor even celebrated by tradition. This is a remarkable fact, when we consider how soon the Church of Rome attained great eminence in the Christian world, both from its members and from the influence of its metropolitan rank. Had any of the apostles laid its foundation, the fact could scarcely fail to have been recorded. It is therefore probable that it was formed in the first instance of private Christians converted in Palestine, who had come from the eastern parts of the empire to reside at Rome, or who had brought back Christianity with them, from some of their periodical visits to Jerusalem, as the 'strangers of Rome,' from the great Pentecost." But we have already seen that "the three thousand" converts on the day of Pentecost were not baptized by dipping, but by pouring or sprinkling. Therefore it is evident that when St. Paul writes to the Church at Rome, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ," etc., baptism by pouring or sprinkling *buries* us with Christ into His death. If Paul and the "strangers of Rome" were buried with Christ by their baptism into His death, which we see was performed by pouring or sprinkling, why should not our baptism accomplish the same end?—especially when we know by experience that we have been baptized by the Holy Ghost, which is evident by our fruits of the Spirit.

Let us then, before proceeding to the main part of

our argument, try our Baptist friends by their own principles, and let us see whether we can find in their own practice an illustration of their principles.

Let us first try them on *immersion*. Their teaching is that baptism is immersion, and nothing else is. The primary meaning of the word *baptizo*, as we have shown from Dr. Dale, means *ersion*, *drowning*, *sinking*, placing a body in a permanent *condition* or *state*, whence it is not to be taken, no provision being made in the word itself for the recovering of the body from that condition or state. Thus the rush and sea-weeds of Aristotle were buried by baptism, when the full tide overwhelmed them; thus the persons mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, inclosed by the river, perished, being classically baptized; thus the Antediluvians were buried in the baptism of Noah; and thus Pharaoh and his army were buried in the baptism of the children of Israel. Let us hold fast to this idea of burying in baptism; it is a good one with reference to the Spirit, if it is rather inconvenient to put it into bodily practice. By the baptism of the Holy Spirit we are buried, as it were, put into a permanent condition of death unto sin, which is no more to have dominion over us forever.

You perceive, therefore, that if any would desire to be baptized according to the *primary*, classical idea of the word, which is contended to be the basis of the figure in the text, it would be necessary to have the water poured upon them until they would be covered or overwhelmed like the rush or sea-

weeds of Aristotle, or the persons mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, or the other examples.

We do not believe that any person has ever been voluntarily baptized according to the primary meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*; but it is not required, according to our view of baptism, since we are guided altogether by the secondary, which is the scriptural use of the word, which is accomplished by pouring or sprinkling.

But why will our Baptist friends require baptism by immersion, in its classical, primary sense, which they say means immersion and nothing else, when they themselves refuse to baptize literally? A rule, which they themselves find inconvenient to carry out, and which would so beautifully illustrate our text—*buried* with Him in baptism—they ought not to impose on others. It reminds us of what the Saviour said to the Pharisees of old: “They say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men’s shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.”

Let us next try them on *dipping*. The word *Tunker* comes from the German *tunken*, to dip. We do not use the word *Tunker* as a term of reproach, no more than the word *Lutheran* is used nowadays by our opponents as such. These are our names respectively, and we must bear them. The principle of the Tunkers or German Baptists seems to be *dipping*. With them dipping is baptizing and baptizing

is dipping. But what is it to *dip*? Evidently, to let down gently into some fluid, and to draw out again; this double action is implied in the word *dip*, but not in the word *baptizo*, as we have proved. To thrust down violently is to *plunge*. To baptize a candidate by dipping, therefore, would be to put him wholly and gently down into the water, and to lift him out again. This then is the correct principle of *dipping*. To this those who advocate that baptism is dipping and nothing else should hold; that is, the practice and the principle should correspond. But let us see how this principle is carried out. The candidate wades into the water, it may be up to his waist, then kneels, leaving his shoulders and head exposed, which the baptizer, while he repeats the baptismal formula, thrusts or plunges into the water three times. Then the candidate is helped up, and walks out of the water. This is called *dipping*, baptism by dipping, illustrating Christ's burial in the sepulchre three days. But that candidate was not dipped, let alone buried; for only his head and shoulders were baptized by plunging. But if baptism is dipping and nothing else, and if dipping is necessary to salvation, then the whole body should be dipped; otherwise the head and shoulders only will be saved. We think that those who lay down the principle that baptism is dipping and nothing else is, should practice the same themselves. To dip a candidate would require four or six men, who would take up the candidate, carry him into the water, and let his whole

body down gently into the water, and lift him out again. Such a person would be really dipped. But some one might say, "This would be very inconvenient." No matter; if the principle that baptism is dipping and nothing else is correct, then it must be carried out, should it be as difficult as to pluck out the right eye or to cut off the right hand.

If the four or six preachers required to dip a person could not be procured, a platform might be erected, and by means of ropes and pulleys the work could be done expeditiously. The practicability of the thing has been demonstrated. Eunomius and his disciples, we are told, did "dip into water the whole body," by the help of ropes and pulleys. The thing has been done, and therefore can be done. But Eunomius was an Arian.

If Baptists contend that it is a divine command to *bury* a candidate by baptism, or to *dip* him, is it not marvelous that they have never, in one instance, for three hundred years, obeyed the command? They are therefore not consistent with their principles. *We* do not hold that the *mode* is essential to baptism; and therefore we are at least consistent in our practice with our principles.

We are, therefore, wholly unable to see, in the modern mode of baptizing, an illustration of the figure employed by St. Paul in the portions of Scripture under consideration. It is because the figure employed is based on the primary, classical use of the word *baptizo*, which belongs to the class of words

represented by *bury*, *drown*, *sink*, *whelm*; while *bapto* belongs to that other class which is represented by *plunge*, *dive*, *dip*, but especially agrees with *dip* in bringing its object out of the element into which it has been briefly and superficially introduced. But *bapto*, we reiterate, is never used in any passage of Scripture in which the ordinance of baptism is mentioned; the word used by the Holy Ghost is invariably *baptizo*, employed in its secondary sense, to wash for ceremonial purification, which is scripturally done by pouring or sprinkling, to bring an object into a new state or condition, and used only in its primary sense, to *bury*, *drown*, or *whelm*, by way of figure, as in the passage under consideration, to illustrate the permanent condition or state into which the Holy Spirit puts us in Christ, which could not be illustrated by ritual baptism, unless by surreptitiously reading into the word the meaning of *bapto*, to dip, which we will not allow by subjection; no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel may continue with us.

When we are baptized into Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, we are to have as little to do with the world, the flesh, and the devil, or sin in general, of which these are the representatives, as the buried dead or drowned have to do with the affairs of the living. The baptism of the Holy Ghost puts us into a permanent *condition* of death unto sin. We thus become like a seed planted in the soil, or buried in the ground, which is no more expected to come to

light, which must die before it is quickened (1 Cor. xv. 36); but we wait for a new plant, a new life, "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear," Mark iv. 28.

But suppose again, for the sake of argument, we admit that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, of which water or ritual baptism is the sign, is like a *burying*, how will that prove that baptism is dipping and nothing else? For we can also prove from the holy Scriptures that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is likened to *pouring*, *sprinkling*, and *washing*. Having proved these points, we might turn round and say, with as much arrogance as our Baptist friends, that baptism is *pouring*, or *sprinkling*, or *washing*, and nothing else. We might also draw on our imagination, as they do, to help us out in this way: "See the filth that is washed away by washing, or pouring, or even by constant gentle sprinkling; and behold how beautifully white the garment is becoming by this process!" The filth washed away might be made to represent our old sins, the old man; and the clean garment the new man. This figure is actually employed by St. Paul in Eph. iv. 25-27, to represent the baptism of the Holy Ghost, where he says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Let us therefore see further where the baptism of the Holy Ghost is compared to *sprinkling*, *pouring*, or *washing*.

Let us take *sprinkling* first. In Isaiah lii. 15, it is said: "So shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider." Of whom does the prophet speak this? Evidently of Christ. The prophet here foretells that when Christ would come, he would purify, cleanse, make holy many nations by sprinkling them. And this idea of purifying by sprinkling is a New Testament idea, used by St. Peter and by St. Paul. 1 Pet. i. 2, "Unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Heb. ix. 13, 14, "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"

In Joel ii. 28, we read: "And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," etc. If you will now turn to the Acts of the Apostles, second chapter, you will find a fulfillment of this prophecy, on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost fell upon the apostles and others associated with them, "and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of

them." To one looking on, would not the sight have been like drops of fire falling on the heads of the apostles? Here we have an ocular demonstration of the mode of Christian baptism, which is adapted to all climes and all peoples. The work did not stop with the apostles; but the multitude came together—"Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphilia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians"—all hearing the apostles speaking in all these diversified languages the wonderful works of God, and all amazed and in doubt, saying one to another, "What meaneth this?" They were informed that it was a fulfillment of the prediction of the prophet Joel; and convicted of their sins, and pricked to the heart by the Holy Ghost, they cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They were directed to repent, and to be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and were assured that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. In all this we have an illustration of the Messiah sprinkling many nations. With this prophecy in their minds, so powerfully illustrated in their own spiritual experience, and the impracticability of baptizing all these people in one day, three thousand, by immersion or dipping, it is highly probable that the apostles baptized them by pouring or sprinkling. At least the baptism of the Spirit is

compared by figure to pouring out water on an object, which was the point to be proved.

Again, in Ezek. xxxvi. 25-27, we have a beautiful Scripture bearing on the same point: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." Turning to Heb. x. 22, we find the New Testament version of this idea: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Here the baptism of the Holy Spirit is compared to *sprinkling*, and the baptism of water to washing; a correspondence between the sign and the thing signified.

Now, in view of all these proofs that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is figuratively spoken of as a sprinkling, pouring, and washing, might we not just as well, and with equal propriety, turn round and say, in as arrogant a manner as our Baptist friends, that baptism is *sprinkling*, or *pouring*, or *washing*, and nothing else; for these are the figures which the Holy Ghost has employed to illustrate his work in our hearts? But this we will not do; for baptism does not consist in the mere mode, whether sprink-

ling, or pouring, or dipping. But baptism signifies the new relation or condition into which we are brought by this sacrament; which may be expressed by pouring, sprinkling, or dipping. For he is not a Christian who is one outwardly; neither is that baptism which is outward on the body: but he is a Christian who is one inwardly; and baptism is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTISM IN CHURCH HISTORY.

THE citadel of the Baptist system being now taken, let us next turn our attention briefly to church history. This is the last outpost upon which the Baptist system relies, but which must fall with the citadel, for if immersion or dipping cannot be established by clear Scripture arguments, it is not likely that church history, with its diversified customs, can help their cause very materially or change our position.

We admit, without the least detriment to our position, that it can be shown from church history that what is called baptism by immersion was extensively practiced in ancient times in the warm climates; but baptism by sprinkling and pouring can also be proved from the same source. From the time of Tertullian, about the beginning of the third century, while the preaching of the gospel was confined to the warmer climates in which it took its rise, baptism by immersion or dipping may have been the general rule, while baptism by sprinkling or pouring may have been the exception, and substituted in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness; but toward the

close of the third century baptism by sprinkling or pouring became the general rule, and baptism by immersion or dipping became the exception. And for this change there was good reason; for by that time the preaching of the gospel and the founding of the church extended into the colder regions of the globe, and the children born in Christian families, and regarded as belonging to the infirm, were baptized. In all this we see the infinite wisdom of Christ, that He did not make the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism depend on the mere mode of its administration. He has commanded His gospel to be preached in all the world, and to all classes and conditions of men; and to make disciples of the sick and the afflicted by baptism, as well as to make disciples of those who are well by baptism. If you choose to take the latter, and to baptize them by immersion or dipping, you have no right to refuse the sick and the infirm baptism by sprinkling or pouring. The ancient church did not refuse baptism to the sick and the infirm by these modes. Take, therefore, your church history and follow it; for church history allows both modes as valid baptism.

But there is a gap in church history between Tertullian and the apostles, which our Baptist friends have never been able to fill up with their mode of immersion or dipping their candidates three times face forward or once backward under water. No Baptist has been able to prove from any historical

facts and authors found in that gap of church history that trine dipping or immersion was practiced from the time of Tertullian back to the days of the apostles. Justin Martyr, who wrote forty years after the death of St. John, describes primitive baptism as a *washing* with water. But what consolation is there in this for trine dipping, or immersing the candidate under water three times face forward, or once backward?

The primitive church evidently regarded the mode of baptism as non-essential. In reference to such things St. Paul has said: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And again: "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men."

From all that has now been said, we conclude that the Baptist theory, that baptism is immersion or dipping and nothing else, cannot be proved: neither by John's baptism, which was not Christian baptism, nor by the Greek word *baptizo*, which is the only word used by the Holy Ghost in speaking of the sacrament, nor by the places where Scripture baptism was administered, nor by the figurative use of the word, nor satisfactorily by church history.

CHAPTER IX.

NATURE AND DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

THE nature and design of baptism will help us to a right understanding of this sacrament by showing us that it does not consist in the mere mode of its administration.

What then is baptism? Luther says: "Baptism is not mere water; but it is that water which the ordinance of God enjoins, and which is connected with God's word. For without the word, the water is mere water, and no baptism; but with the word of God it is a baptism, that is, a merciful water of life, and a laver of regeneration in the Holy Ghost: as St. Paul says to Titus, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He has saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

St. Peter says: "Baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God." When our conscience is cleansed by faith in Christ from dead works to serve the living God, such faith finds its expression or an-

swer in baptism. Baptism is a constant answer or expression of faith in Christ. It is therefore the seal of the righteousness of faith. That is, that the righteousness of Christ is counted or reckoned to us through faith; because such faith includes Christ and has Him present. Baptism is therefore a constant witness that we are justified by Christ. It is a perpetual sign of this great truth.

The nature and design of baptism must therefore be sought in its essential things, not in the mere mode of its administration. To seek the nature and design of baptism in the mode of its administration is materialistic in its tendency. We might as well say, as some even do, that the soul of man consists in the mode of his brain's operations, as to say that baptism consists in the mode of its administration. The essential elements in baptism are the water, the word of God, and the divine command. The outward part of baptism is washing with water, and any mode of using water, which preserves the idea of washing, may be regarded as a proper mode; and consequently immersion is not essential to baptism, because it is not essential to washing.

Baptism is an appeal to the heart and conscience through the senses, besides the ordinary method of directly addressing the truth to the ear. Baptism is the word in a symbol. The symbol expresses a necessity of our nature. The truth would assume a visible representation, and the word would clothe itself in the garb of visible things. The essential

word Himself assumed a visible form. "The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." "A body hast thou prepared me." Our whole life is interpenetrated by symbols. The thoughts of our minds, the tendencies of our hearts, these all seek a symbolical expression. Why not also the religious life? No divine service can stand without symbols. The whole *cultus* is a holy symbol. And do we not unconsciously introduce into our whole lives the symbol? When we move our hand, when we nod our head and lift it up, when we bend our knees, it is all a symbolical, a sensible expression of that which is unseen. We love to be surrounded by symbols. We have made the cross the universal symbol of Christianity. Every picture of the Redeemer is for us a symbol. In all science there is something symbolical; for it seeks to set forth the invisible world of spirit in visible form. The higher the subject it would represent, so much the more will the science become a manifestation of the thing. But the painter will never succeed in painting into the countenance of Jesus Christ the full revelation of grace and truth. All true science therefore contains something symbolical. It thus becomes a leader to conduct us out of the visible into the invisible. All the parables of the Saviour are built on this principle. We need such helps to bring us out of the carnal into the spiritual. No religion is without symbols: also not the Christian. "But," as Dr. Luthardt says, "higher than the symbol of the thing stands the

symbol of the action. The concentrated symbol is symbolical action. In every kind of religion we find symbolical actions; the Christian religion also has them. They are involuntary. When I bless another, I lay involuntarily my hand on his head. The cultus is a system of symbolical actions: also the Christian. When these fail, it becomes bald and cold. They bespeak a necessity of our nature. But there is a difference between the Christian religion and that which preceded it. This was the religion of prophecy, that is, the religion of fulfillment. The symbols of the Christian religion do not point to some future import, but they speak to us of something present, and the highest contain what they symbolize. These are the sacraments. The sacraments are symbolical actions, but they are fulfilled symbols; they contain the things which they specify."

We reckon only two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Before Jesus departed from His disciples He instituted Christian baptism, as the sacrament through which all those who were willing should be received into the number of His disciples. Christ's commission literally interpreted is this: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, in that ye baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and in that ye teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Baptism is therefore the sacrament of initiation into the Christian Church. The outer form of baptism is not new. It was connected

with divers washings and former ceremonies, as we have already seen. In the Old Testament there were washings and ceremonies and purifyings; and John the Baptist made use of water-baptism as a symbol of repentance and remission of sins and as a preparation for entrance into the kingdom of God. But Christ implanted into this form a new signification. The content of this He expressed in the formula of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which is to be employed in this transaction.

By baptism we are to be received into fellowship with the Triune God and His salvation. The central point of salvation, as a revelation, however, is the atonement made by the cross, the forgiveness of sins. This is what is signified by baptism. It is a symbol of grace. The symbol lies in the elements combined with it, and in the transaction itself. On this point Luther says: "We divide baptism into three distinct parts, which are the water, the word, and the command or order of God. Thus we must not only regard the water like other water, but the word also, which is the word of God, in or with the water; and thirdly, the will and power of God, or His command and institution. These are the parts which belong to the entire nature, and to the proper definition of baptism. And they should be viewed in immediate connection with each other, and not be severed and separated, since in union with each other they constitute a correct baptism.

"For in order that it may *be*, and be *called* a sacra-

ment, it is necessary first of all that some external, tangible sign or substance be employed, through which God deals visibly with us, so that we may be assured of His operation. For without some external sign or medium, God will not operate upon us, merely by deeply secret inspiration, or a peculiar divine revelation. But the external work and sign will effect and accomplish nothing at all if His word is not added, through which this sign becomes mighty, and we perceive what God is accomplishing with us by this sign. But the divine command also must be united to both these, in order that we may become assured of His will and work in this sign and word. These three parts, accordingly, I most carefully discriminate."

Water is the means of purification, and the ceremony of washing is the ceremony of purification. Baptism signifies purification from sins. It signifies not merely that we shall purify ourselves, but that God will purify us.

But it not only signifies this; it also conveys what it signifies. It is a means of grace. It is the ground of a Christian life, which must begin in the grace of God. The Christian life is a life of communion with God. The hindrance to this communion is the debt of sin. What we first need, in order to this communion, is the forgiveness of our sins. Baptism is the sacrament of purification of the conscience from sins, with the end of uniting it with God. The bond of connection between the purified conscience and God

is the Holy Ghost. "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." "Beloved, if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask we receive of Him, because we keep His commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in His sight." The Holy Ghost cleanses our conscience from dead works, and unites us in fellowship with the Father and the Son. Baptism is therefore the covenant of a good conscience with God. Baptism is therefore designed to teach the moral impurities of man, and the necessity and the insurance of his cleansing by the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit through His Word.

Moreover, it is designed to sustain and perpetuate the Church throughout all ages. Without the sacraments the Church cannot be perpetuated in the world. Do away with symbols of grace, and you will soon do away with the internal realities of religion. The sacraments and rites of the Old Dispensation were adapted to minds far less elevated than to those of the New. Hence the number of ordinances of the Old as compared with those of the New. The most uncompromising and successful enemies of Christianity have always aimed at the destruction of external symbols.

Baptism is necessary to salvation, because the grace of God is offered to us through it. That is, baptism is necessary, not merely because it is necessary for us to do what God commands us to do, in

which sense every commandment of God is the medium of divine grace, not merely because he enjoins it, but because *in, with and under* it this grace is offered. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." Baptism is meant to point out something distinctively on God's side responsive to faith on our side to our salvation. In other words, that as in our faith we go forth toward God, so in holy baptism God comes forth to us, and offers in it to our faith that which imparts salvation. He meets us in our baptism to assure our weak consciences of the forgiveness of our sins, and of eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ. He shows us in our baptism that the application of the blood of Christ, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, are necessary to prepare us for heaven, and that salvation is here present and here offered to us through free grace.

The first question is, What grace is offered to us in baptism? We reply: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." The grace of justification, "have put on Christ," is offered to us in our baptism. Besides, the grace of a renewed heart and holy life, the grace of sanctification, is assured to us in our baptism. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized

into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." "Buried," *i. e.*, utterly sundered from sin as a buried man is from the living world. We are put into a permanent state or condition of rest from our old sins as pertaining to the conscience. "And for this cause He is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

The phrase above, "that we also should walk in newness of life," not only implies moral duty, but that the person so baptized does so walk, *i. e.*, through baptism we may, can and do thus walk. As St. Paul also says in his Epistle to the Ephesians in the same line: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." That is, literally, "by the washing of water in the word," or "by the washing of water joined with the word," because the natural and the spiritual elements are conjoined in holy baptism.

Moreover, the grace of salvation is offered to us in our baptism. So St. Peter: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not

the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Also St. Paul: "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward men appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

Again, the grace of God is *always* offered to us in our baptism. God has in this act made with us an everlasting covenant. "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance (*change*)." God never changes His mind in the covenant of baptism. While the ground remains on which He originally acted, He never revokes His gifts. Baptism, therefore, as a divine institution, is an unchangeable thing. God did not institute two kinds of baptisms, as some dream, in one of which grace is offered, and in the other is not. "For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?" That is, if the blessing is not realized by this or that person, it is not because the blessing is not in God's ordinance, but because it is not received. For though grace is always offered in baptism, yet it is not always conferred. The baptism in its validity and exercise, our faith or unbelief can in no degree change; but on our faith its blessings

are conditioned. If a man has a golden eagle offered him, he may take it or reject it. The character and value of the golden eagle depend in no degree on his knowledge of them, or on his faith about them. If he has no faith in the case, he may barter it for a trifle, or he may throw it away. So with baptism.

Our confessors carefully and thoroughly used the words, "*Grace is offered in baptism,*" implying: That all who receive baptism savingly receive grace. They knew well that a man may be baptized and be a godless man; for baptism is not grace, but a means of grace. Only those who exercise faith savingly receive grace. The grace of God is always offered in baptism, and is actually conferred upon and received by those who have faith. The grace of baptism may be lost by him who has it; he may fall from grace. But the grace of God offered in baptism, but not wholly received by lack of faith, may be savingly secured by faith in later times.

We deduce the following conclusions :

1. Objections to our doctrine of baptismal grace, as if we held mechanically, physically and inevitably to the outward application of water, by which the salvation of the soul was made sure, are founded in gross ignorance and wicked perversion.

2. Equally groundless is the self-delusive plea of him who assumes that because grace is always offered in baptism, he is in grace because baptized, although his life be one of unbelief and godlessness.

3. The true Scripture doctrine of the efficacy of

holy baptism, as taught in the Confession of our Church, nourishes no false reliance, but a spirit of perpetual watchfulness; while on the other hand it implies a most glorious assurance in the hearts of those who are true to the baptismal covenant, that in their baptism they have not only a solemn pledge that God has received them as His own, but have also a spring of sustaining grace. They know that what baptism offers it offers always; and what it offers it actually confers upon all who are willing to receive it—even God's rich grace, regenerating, justifying, sanctifying, saving, and glorifying. It is not in the power of human language to exaggerate the blessings of baptism to him who rightly receives and continues rightly to use it. So says Dr. Krauth in his *Lectures on Baptism*.

We close this chapter by a quotation from Luther, in which he sets forth the *nature* and *design* of baptism:

"I do not speak concerning the efficacy and advantages of baptism, the immense effects which it produces; of this we will speak hereafter; but concerning its constitutional nature, as it is in itself. I remark here, if you observe this particular, how this water is united with the Word and name of God, because in its administration He Himself has commanded us to pronounce the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," as if He had said, "I, God the Father, I, God the Son, and Holy Ghost, sanctify this water," therefore you cannot say that it is merely a perishable water;

or, as our adversaries denominate it, water for the washing even of dogs; but you must say it is the water of the divine majesty Himself, as we mortals do not baptize with it, but God Himself through our hands; and He has inserted and incorporated His name with it, that it may be mingled with His name, and may very properly be termed water thoroughly divine. For precisely as when you grasp a piece of iron, which is lying heated in the forge, you grasp not merely iron, but the fire also which is in it; and although you do not see the fire, but only the iron, as we cannot see the fire glowing so well by day as by night, yet it is still not only iron, but both iron and fire; indeed so thoroughly has the fire penetrated through and through it, that we can feel or experience nothing but the touch of fire; so we should regard the water of baptism, embodying the name of God, and altogether and completely penetrated with it, so that it has become entirely the same essence, and is now a thing far different from other water. Like some precious beverage which we present to a sick man, which, although it is mostly composed of water, yet it is so entirely impregnated with precious spice and sugar that it has no longer any taste of water in it. But here is by far a more precious water, which is sweetened with the name of God, indeed altogether and entirely divine, though before our eyes we see nothing more than water.

“ You have now what may be said concerning the power and advantages of baptism; all which, as rep-

resented above, Christ has comprised in His own words, where He says, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' For by this He gives us to understand that His will and ordinance are that we receive baptism, not in order that the body may be washed, and remain outwardly pure and clean, like the daily purifications of the ancient Jews; nor that it might be a mere empty sign, by which people might know us, as the Jews, with their circumcision; but exclusively with the design that we may be saved by it, that is, be freed from sin, death, and hell, and every evil, to be eternally righteous, holy, and vigorous, the heirs of heaven. For all this must result from this expression. For, if man be saved, his freedom from sin and justification must precede; as no one will be saved, except him who is righteous and holy beforehand. Again, if he shall be saved, he must be freed from death, and possess life: besides, he must be secured from hell and condemnation; and finally every calamity, unhappiness, and sorrow, fear and terror, must be taken away, and he must be brought to everlasting tranquillity and joy. All this, I say baptism brings to us; not because it is water, but because the name and power of God is in it, who has ordained that it shall be a heavenly, divine water; and He will give us these blessings by means both of this water and His word. For He has power and strength abundantly sufficient to produce this effect whenever He wills or determines, even through a substance much less considerable than water."

PART II.
THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER X.

THE GREAT COMMISSION.

Who are the proper subjects of baptism? To this we reply, "Adult believers and also infants." We have no right to exclude infants from baptism; for God expressly established infant membership in His Church, at its first visible organization, and never since withdrew this privilege. Gen. xvii. 12, "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you," etc.

Hence, as the covenant (church), then established by God, was "*everlasting*," it must, as the apostle teaches (Rom. xi. 20-24), extend to the end of the world substantially the same church. And, as God established infant membership in it, no one can revoke it but God Himself, which He has not done.

With us Lutherans baptism has become mostly infant baptism. As long as the Church retains the character of a mission, she is conversant with the Word and adult baptism. But as soon as she has anywhere attained a firm foothold, she looks upon the children that are born in her bosom as her children, and receives them into the fellowship of the salvation whose bearer she is. We, therefore, take

the position that infants of Christian parents are proper subjects for Christian baptism and church membership. Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., in harmony with this, says: "All orthodox denominations hold baptism as a sacrament, but all do not regard it of like importance.

"As between those churches that practice infant baptism, the Lutheran, with possibly a single exception, gives this sacrament the greatest significance both in creed and practice. While some treat it as of divine *origin*, the Lutheran maintains it as also of divine *command*. While others regard it proper and salutary, she holds it to be also necessary. The language of our Confession is: 'Concerning baptism our churches teach that it is necessary to salvation; that through baptism the grace of God is offered; and that children are to be baptized, who being by baptism offered to God are received into His favor.' Out of this doctrine grows our precious view of infant membership.

"We teach that inasmuch as baptism is the initiatory rite into the Christian Church, and is a means of grace connected with the plan of salvation, therefore baptized children are in the Church of Christ, being in the same covenant of God as adult members, with only the disabilities of infancy upon them, rendering it for the time being impossible for them to use all the rights of full membership. Meanwhile they are in the school of Christ under training for higher discipleship, being constantly reminded that their bap-

tism has put upon them the seal of God's covenant whereby they have been incorporated into the kingdom of Christ on earth.

“ Under such teaching they grow up with the sense of divine obligation and church relationship which well prepares them in due time for the assumption of all the duties of the Christian life in the confirmation of their baptismal vows.

“ Some American churches seem to treat baptized children the same as outright sinners needing conversion before they are worthy of being called Christians. Whereas our Church teaches that at baptism children begin to be converted, and from that day are put under the divine administration of renewing grace together with the adult disciples of Christ.

“ Any Church that has no place in her membership for the infants and the children of the Christian family is but half a Church. It is not after the Jewish model, which includes the children of every age, nor yet after the Christian, which is equally comprehensive. Though such denominations may be orthodox in the fundamentals, they do not apprehend the full meaning of this precious sacrament when either they entirely withhold from or limit its grace with children. Probably no feature of our Church gives her greater strength than her teaching and practice on this subject. It is a vantage ground of priceless value which, if she faithfully appreciate and use, cannot but make her more and more the foremost Protestant Church in the world.

“ It is a well recognized fact of other denominations that the young people of Lutheran parentage, by reason of the religious instruction and training generally given them under our system, are among the most desirable material of which to build up their own congregations. Hence their constant temptation to the practice of proselyting, which, while it is a reproach to them, ought to be a cause of shame to many of our people for showing less appreciation of their own Church than even strangers.

“ Happily the day is at hand when those who bear our name, as well as others, are coming more fully to realize what an inestimable treasure we possess in our system of spiritual culture for the young, growing out of our superior views and practice of infant baptism.

“ How glorious that Church which offers such fullness of the provisions of salvation that not even the youngest child need be left out of the kingdom and Church of Christ for a single day!” We get our authority for infant baptism:

From the Lord Jesus.—No one will dispute this authority, for Jesus says: “ All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth.” But it is denied that Jesus has given us this authority. We, however, appeal to the general commission with which He has clothed the ministers of the Word: “ Go ye therefore, and teach (*matheteusate, make disciples of,*) all nations,” etc. The word *nation*, as its etymology

imports (*natus, born; or nascor, to be born*), originally denoted a family or race of men descended from a common progenitor. The command must therefore include men, women, and children. But how are we to make disciples of these? The commission contains an answer to this question. It is by *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and by *teaching* them to observe the instructions of Jesus.

On the grammatical point of the commission, Dr. Campbell, a distinguished Baptist, says that "the active participle always, when connected with a verb in the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed. Cleanse the room—washing it; clean the floor—sweeping it; cultivate the field—ploughing it; sustain the hungry—feeding them; furnish the soldiers—arming them; convert the nations—baptizing them, are exactly the same form of speech." (*Christian Baptism*, p. 630.)

The command is general; and if the Saviour had desired children to be excluded, He would most assuredly have told us. The question therefore is: How would the apostles likely understand the commission? Just as we understand a general law when there is no exception given or implied. Especially when the apostles were accustomed to infant membership in the Jewish Church, which was preparatory to the Christian Church. And if they had any misapprehensions as to the relation of children to the

Christian Church, these must have been entirely removed by the Saviour's rebuke, when He said, on the occasion when the Israelitish mothers brought young children to Him, that He should touch them, and the disciples rebuked those that brought them: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God," Mark x. 14. Luke has it: "They brought unto Him also infants, that He would touch them," Luke xviii. 15. There can therefore be no dispute as to the age of the subjects under consideration.

The desire of these mothers in Israel to see their children, then infants, blessed by Jesus, sprang from a similar feeling that lies in the hearts of all Christian parents, and that is in a great measure the foundation for the Christian baptism of our children, especially since the Saviour has approved of this common feeling in the hearts of Christian parents. He was pleased with this feeling. Could the Saviour be pleased with anything wrong? No, never. But we will tell you with whom He was not well pleased. He was very much displeased, and took it very ill, that the disciples hindered the mothers from bringing their children to Jesus. If the Twelve thought that children must first become like them, grown up, in order to secure the interest of the Saviour in them, our Lord, on the other hand, gave them to understand that they must first become like little children, if they would become participants of His regard. The conduct of the Twelve toward these

mothers in Israel is a very striking illustration of the spirit of grumblers against infant baptism.

Christ's joyful reception of these little children, and His displeasure against those who would hinder them from being brought, have established a clear principle by which we may rest assured that children, infants, are included in the general commission, to make disciples of all nations.

The command, therefore, for baptizing children is exactly the command for baptizing any human creatures, neither more nor less. If we were asked where infant baptism is expressly enjoined in the New Testament, our reply would be, in the baptismal commission, in which neither male nor female, adult nor infant, is specifically mentioned, but male and female, adult and infant, are generically mentioned in the one *all-embracing* term NATION.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FITNESS OF CHILDREN FOR BAPTISM.

“FOR of such is the kingdom of heaven,” Matt. xix. 14. The kingdom of heaven, or the Church of Christ, is a divine institution, established on earth for the salvation of men. This kingdom must have subjects. Who are the proper subjects? We reply, in the language of Jesus, children: “for of such is the kingdom of heaven.” Literally, “To such belongs the kingdom of heaven.” The kingdom of heaven consists of subjects who have been received into favor of the King. Who are these but such as have their sins forgiven? Infants have no actual sins, but only original sin, which is forgiven by virtue of the atonement made for all men by Jesus Christ. Therefore there is no hindering cause to obstruct the work of grace in the heart of a child, no more than there is in one who has been justified by faith. As soon as an adult believes in Jesus, the hindering cause to the pardon of his actual sins is at once removed, and he enters into the blessedness of a pardoned sinner, and thus he reaches the same basis as that on which the child stands in the kingdom of grace. There is no more condemnation to a child that is in Christ by

baptism than there is to an adult who is in Christ by baptism, and who, being justified by faith, has peace with God.

If there is any difference between an adult believer and an infant, as to the right of baptism, the better right belongs to the child; for the child has never been polluted by bad habits, which have become to the adult almost a second nature. Although pardoned, he has notwithstanding weakened his moral nature, and in this respect the child has the advantage over the adult. Take the converted drunkard or libertine, and a little innocent child, and bring them both under the saving influence of the Church, and the child will have a better chance of reaching the goal than the adult. Whoever weakens his moral nature by bad habits runs a fearful risk of losing his soul in the end. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil," Jer. xiii. 23. Grace, in this respect, runs very much in a channel similar to natural law. Hence the Bible says, "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it," Prov. xxii. 6. The reason is that good habits have been established by grace. Children have the very strongest susceptibility to grace; and, in this respect also, they have the advantage over adult believers.

Children have need of the grace of God as well as adults; for the former are depraved as well as the latter, only the moral obliquity of children has not

yet been developed. Our children, it is true, have no knowledge of what takes place in their baptism; for they have yet no understanding. But does it follow that they are not brought into a state or condition of grace by baptism? Is not the child by this act of baptism declared to be an heir of God, and a joint-heir with Christ? Baptism is the expression for this. "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world: but when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons," Gal. iv. 1-5.

The universal and benevolent design, therefore, of God, in establishing His kingdom, will not allow that any human creature, who is morally qualified to be received into that kingdom, should be excluded. But we have seen that we are received into that kingdom, the Church, by baptism. This accords with the Scriptures: "Who will have all men (that is, all human creatures,) to be saved." Again, "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish," 1 Tim. ii. 4; Matt. xviii. 14.

CHAPTER XII.

THE APOSTLES AND CHURCH HISTORY.

THE apostles were divinely inspired teachers, and they illustrated in their ministry how the commission of Christ is to be understood.

In the Acts of the Apostles we are informed that they baptized whole households. For Christianity is the soul not only of an individual, but also of a domestic fellowship,. We therefore call attention to a consideration of the following passages of Scripture:

The conversion and baptism of Cornelius and all his house, Acts x. 1-2, 44-48. Cornelius was one that feared God with all his house. Having been divinely directed, he sent for Peter to hear the gospel preached. While the apostle preached the Word of the Lord to Cornelius and his household, and to many others assembled together on the occasion, the Holy Ghost fell on those who heard the Word; and the apostle commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.

The baptism of Lydia and her household, Acts xvi. 15.

The baptism of the Philippian jailer and all his
(135)

house, Acts xvi. 30-33. The baptism of Crispus with all his house, Acts xviii. 8.

The baptism of Stephanas and his household, 1 Cor. i. 16.

Now, a glance at any neighborhood will show that families without children are the exception, not the general rule. Therefore there must have been children in the five families mentioned, and they must have been baptized with the rest. To say the least, it is highly probable that they were baptized along with the adults in the same families; for so it is recorded.

Also, St. Paul's address to children in Ephesians vi. 1. Here is his language: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right." Herein lies an argument for infant membership in the Church of Christ, which I confess I overlooked for many years, until my attention was called to it by Dr. Luthardt in his *Compend of Dogmatik*. The apostle's epistle is addressed to a church in which were children that were members. This cannot be denied. How did these children become members of the Church? There is only one way, and that is by baptism. Let our opponents show that this is not true.

In some of these cases the household is said to have believed, which does not, of necessity, exclude infants, who by the grace of God can believe, and who, both in the circumcision of the Old Testament and in the baptism of the New Testament, are properly regarded as believers, and are reckoned among

the believers. If, for argument's sake, we grant for a moment that when mention is made of faith in a household, it implies that none of them were infants, then, logically, when no mention is made of faith, the inference is that there were infants. But in the case of Lydia and Stephanas, there is no mention made of faith. Besides, Peter says, without limitation to those whom he addressed, "The promise is to you and your children." And Paul and Silas, before any faith, on the part of the household, existed, said to the jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," implying, just as under the Abrahamic covenant, the father and head of the household represented it, and that his children and his sons were embraced in its promises. Hence not a solitary instance, of which we know, in the New Testament, is found, in which the family of a man was not baptized with him..

As to Church History, see Luther's Small Catechism, pages 19 and 20. I will give a synopsis of the facts mentioned. "Origen, one of the church fathers, who was born only eighty-five years after St. John's death, and other Christian fathers, assert that infant baptism was handed down to their age from the days of the apostles. During the first four hundred years from the formation of the Christian Church, neither any society of men, nor any individual, denied the lawfulness of infant baptism. Tertullian urged only the delay of infant baptism, and that not in all cases. And Gregory only delayed it,

perhaps, in his own children. In the next seven hundred years there was no society, and no individual, who even pleaded its delay, much less any who denied the right or duty of infant baptism. In the year 1120, one sect rejected infant baptism, but that sect was opposed by the other churches as heretical, and was soon brought to nothing. From that time no one opposed infant baptism until the year 1522; since when, also, the great body of the Christian Church has continued the practice of infant baptism."

That infant baptism has been handed down from the days of the apostles seems evident from the fact that St. John, like St. Paul, regards the children of believers as members of the Christian Church. In 1 John ii. 12, we have the following: "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for His name's sake." These little children and fathers, and young men, are all addressed as belonging to the Christian Church. But how could they belong to the Christian Church without baptism? It is therefore altogether probable that the introduction and exercise of infant baptism is as old as the independent existence of the Christian Church. Under these circumstances we have every reason to believe that infant baptism was actually practiced in the five families mentioned above, which are recorded only as examples, leaving us to infer the existence of many similar ones, while yet it would be contrary to all experience to suppose all the families to have been without small children.

And the opposition of Tertullian to infant baptism, proves most decidedly the existence of infant baptism, at that time, as well as the custom of having sponsors. Nay, more, Tertullian was aware that the practice of the whole Church was against him, and therefore he came out, though unsuccessfully, as a reformer. Had he been able to appeal to antiquity and to oppose infant baptism as an innovation, he would certainly have taken advantage of this position. But he does not question the apostolic origin of this ordinance, nor even its propriety and legality. So says Dr. Schaff.

Justin Martyr, in his Apology, speaks of those who from the time they were little children, were made disciples of Christ.

Irenæus, in his second book against heretics, says of Christ: "He came to save all through Himself—all, I say, are born again unto God, infants, and little ones, and children, and the young men, and the old men."

Cyprian, in his epistle to Phidas, third book, letter eighth, according to Dr. Krauth, speaking of a council of sixty-six bishops, says, "It was the judgment of the whole, that to no one born of man is the pity and grace of God to be denied," and at the end of the letter says, "that the judgment of the council was that none should be prohibited by us from baptism and the grace of God; especially in regard to infants and those but recently born, did we regard it as a thing to be observed."

Ambrose says, " Christ commands all nations to be baptized; therefore neither the old proselyte, nor the infant of our own house is excepted, for every age has sin and therefore every age needs the sacrament."

Augustine says, " Even the Pelagians did not dare to deny the baptism of the little ones, because they say that to deny it would bring them into open conflict with the entire Church "

Infant baptism has been practiced throughout all Christendom, in the Greek Church, in the Roman Church, and in the Oriental sects. The history of infant baptism can be accounted for on no other supposition than that it is apostolic and divine in its origin.

We may also mention in this connection inscriptions found in the catacombs of Rome. In these we meet with the epitaphs of children who are called neophytes, a title which, of course, could not have been bestowed upon them unless they had been received by baptism into the Church. The age at which they died precludes the idea of that rite having been administered to them in any way but as infants. Here is a translation of one: " The title of Candidus the neophyte, who lived twenty-one months, buried on the nones of September." Does not all this show conclusively from Church History that infant baptism was practiced in the early ages of the Christian Church? How shall we account for this universal practice of infant baptism in the primitive

church otherwise than that the apostles themselves introduced it? Let the opponents account for this fact in any other way, if they can.

Luther says: "*First*, because infant baptism has descended from the apostles and the practice has continued ever since the apostolic age, we should not abolish it, but allow it thus to be observed, since no one has yet been able to prove that *children do not believe* when they are *baptized*, or that this kind of baptism is wrong. For even if I were not certain that they believe, I must still, for the sake of my conscience, allow them to be baptized, as it is far better for baptism to be administered to children than for me to abolish it. For if this baptism be right and beneficial, and confer salvation upon children, as we believe, and were I to abolish it, I should be accountable for all the children that might be lost for the want of baptism: this would be a fearful responsibility indeed. But if it were wrong, that is, useless and unprofitable to children, there could be no other sin committed by it except what the Word of God would pronounce in vain, and His sign given to no purpose; I would be guilty of no lost soul in consequence of it, but only of the use of God's Word and sign in vain."

"*Secondly*, there is one strong indication of the divine authority for infant baptism. No heresy has ever yet endured permanently, but it has always, and in a short time too, as St. Peter says, been exposed and brought to shame; as St. Paul writes of

Jannes and Jambres, and persons similar to them, saying that their folly became manifest to all men, 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9. Now, if infant baptism were wrong, God undoubtedly would not have suffered it to continue so long, or to be so universally observed throughout the whole Christian community; nor could it have escaped from being at last brought into disrepute before all men. For although the Anabaptists now defame it, yet their attempts are ineffectual, and it is not yet brought into disgrace." Luther on the Sacraments, pp. 123, 124.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

THE Apostle Peter says to the repentant Jews: "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." To what promise does the apostle here allude? Evidently to the promise which God made to Abraham. This was, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," Gen. xxii. 18. By turning to Paul's epistle to the Galatians, iii. 16, we find how this promise is to be understood, that it is applicable to spiritual Israel, viz., "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Therefore the promise is that in Christ we and our children and all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call by the gospel, are to be blessed. Does not this show conclusively that our children are entitled to the grace of the covenant? But what is the grace of the covenant? It is *the promised Spirit*. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the

blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith," Gal. iii. 13, 14. If children can receive the grace of the covenant, or the promised Spirit, which no one who believes in the salvation of children will dare to deny, then children are entitled also to the seal of the covenant, which is baptism.

In order to show that baptism is the seal of the covenant of grace, the covenant that in Christ all the families of the earth should be blessed, should receive the promised Spirit, let us turn, first, to Rom. iv. 4, "And he (*Abraham*) received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also." Circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith. That is, it was a seal that faith in the promised Seed, which is Christ, justifies man before God or brings the promised Spirit; for this is the point which the apostle is arguing. He says, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." That is, *faith* in Christ, the promised Seed, was counted by God to Abraham in the place of righteousness; because such faith apprehended or included Christ. Abraham had no personal righteousness which could justify him before God, but his faith in the promised Seed, which secured the merits of that just man

Christ Jesus, the God-man, was counted or reckoned to Abraham in the place of a personal righteousness of his own, which he ought to have had, but which, however, he could not produce by his own sinful power, because he was a sinner. The promised Spirit, or the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which Abraham's faith secured in the Seed, Christ, would produce the new obedience or a personal righteousness. But no one will deny that circumcision was just as much a seal of the righteousness of faith in Isaac, when he was circumcised, being eight days old, as it was in Abraham when he was a hundred years old. Who will deny, when he has this explicit passage before his eyes, that Isaac was justified before God, having the seal of the covenant put upon him? He was then justified before God by virtue of the merits of the promised Seed, Christ, into whom he was engrafted by circumcision, "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." That is, the righteousness which is secured by faith. Abraham secured it for himself and for his children by his faith in Christ, not, indeed, in such a way that neither he nor his children could forfeit the blessing of the covenant, but yet he secured it for himself and his children.

Abraham was justified by faith, or he had received the promised Spirit by faith before he was circumcised. He had received the blessed witness of the

Spirit through faith in Christ, that his iniquities were forgiven and his sins covered before he was circumcised. As St. Paul says: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also, and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised."

Now, all this reasoning both Peter and Paul show is applicable to the Christian family. These are the words of Paul: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences and was raised again for our justification," Rom. iv. 23-25. And the same apostle sets forth the whole plan of salvation in Gal. iii. 13, 14, where he says: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

What, then, is "the blessing of Abraham?" It is not a blessing bestowed on us by Abraham, but it is the blessing which Abraham received from God

through faith. It is justification by faith. It is the reception of the promised Spirit, the Holy Spirit, through faith. It is what Paul writes to the Church of the Ephesians, where he says: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory," Eph. i. 13, 14. This justification by faith, this promised Spirit through faith, was sealed to Abraham and his seed in covenant stipulations, all of which is applicable to the Christian family.

But some say children cannot believe, therefore they should not be baptized, which point will come up more fully in the discussion hereafter; but we will now say that if children are excluded from the Christian Church then the Abrahamic covenant has failed, and it is not for our children, nor the children of Abraham. But Isaac was included and became heir of the world, received the promised Spirit as stipulated in the seal of the covenant; and the children, who are baptized, are also included; for Peter says: "The promise is unto you and to your children." The promised Spirit, justification by faith, is to you and to your children. Have any Christian parents through the righteousness of faith secured the promised Spirit for their children? Thousands and tens of thousands. The Christian Church has

been propagated in that way from the beginning. We have received the promised Spirit stipulated in the Abrahamic covenant. "Through baptism we receive the assurance that the divine blessings which the Christian doctrine promises concern even *us*, and that even *we* may participate in them; or, in other words, these blessings are by this rite particularly applied to our own personal state, and we learn in faith to appropriate them to ourselves. As any one, on being formally admitted as a citizen of a town, in taking the oath of citizenship, and going through the other rites of initiation, receives the confident assurance that he has now a title to all the rights and privileges of citizenship, so it is with the Christian in baptism. It is the same, in this view, with baptism as with circumcision. This Paul calls (Rom. iv. 11) a *sign* and *seal* for Abraham and his posterity—*i. e.*, a token of assurance and a proof that God was favorably disposed towards him and justified him on account of his faith. So baptism is to every one the token of assurance that he may partake in all those spiritual blessings which Christianity promises. Whoever, therefore, is baptized, receives the assurance that his sins are forgiven him for the sake of Christ—that God, for the sake of Christ, looks upon him with favor and regards him as a child, and that he, in faithful obedience to the commands of Jesus (and by enjoying the constant aid of the Holy Spirit which is promised), may securely expect eternal blessedness, Acts ii. 38; Gal. iii. 27; Mark xvi. 16."—*Dr. Knapp.*

What force would Paul's powerful argument, in the fourth chapter of Romans, have if our children were not entitled to the blessing of the covenant, the promised Spirit? On this the whole argument turns. To say that children have a part in the covenant of grace, which is the covenant which God made with Abraham, and then to deny them the sign of the covenant, which in the Christian Church is baptism, would be marvelous indeed.

That baptism, as a sign of the covenant, has come into the place of circumcision, is evident from Col. ii. 11, 12, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are raised with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." Here *circumcision* and *baptism* are both used as seals of the righteousness of faith; the former as the seal of the Church before Christ, and the latter as the seal of the Church after Christ. And if one stands in the place of the other, which no one will deny who understands the spirit of the Bible, then one must have all the force and authority of the other. Or, if one sealed children to the covenant of grace, so must the other. Therefore baptism is the seal of the same covenant that circumcision was, and the former includes all the subjects that the latter did. "For the promise is unto you and to your children." That is divinely inspired language, and who will reverse it?

Our opponents object to infant baptism on the ground that many baptized infants, afterwards, as they grow up, go astray. The same objection might be lodged against adult baptism. Some distinguished Baptist has acknowledged that nine-tenths of the adults who are immersed go astray. We can say better things of our baptized children. The greater part of these grow up to be pious men and women in the Church.

Our opponents also object to *involuntary* church-membership. That is, children should not become members of the Church until they *feel* to become members. We also object to involuntary church-membership in adults; but infants and adults cannot, in this respect, be treated alike. Upon the same ground we might say that children ought not to go to school until they *feel* to go. If that course should be taken by parents with their children, the most of children would stay out of school all the time, would grow up in ignorance, and would become a curse to Church and State. We must lead our children in the right direction. "Train up a child in the way he should go." This means that we are to lead the *wills* of our children—that we are to teach them *obedience*.

The Bible says, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord." But how could children obey their parents in the Lord, if both parents and children were not in the Lord? For to be "*in the Lord*" means to be in the Church by baptism, Rom. xvi. 11-13.

This is just as plain as language can make it. It would have no meaning in families where the Lord is not acknowledged. Look for a moment at the language of the commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother." This was addressed to the children of the Church. Those who are "*in the Lord*" are those who are in the Church by baptism. That is what is meant by the phrase in the Bible.

The Abrahamic covenant is further illustrated by St. Paul in Rom. xi. 17-26. Here are his exact words: "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural

branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" Here the Church of God is compared to a good olive tree, into which God's ancient people were grafted by circumcision. God's ancient people were grafted into the good olive tree by families, the father and all the male children being circumcised, and his wife and daughters standing in the same relation to the covenant by virtue of their union with the head of the family.

Now, the apostle teaches us that the same good olive tree is yet standing, although some of the ancient families were broken off, and also that into the same good olive tree there have been other families grafted. The ancient families or branches which were broken off failed because the life of the good olive tree ceased to reach them. This is the natural consequence with all branches that do not receive the fatness of the tree. The apostle teaches us that the good olive tree is yet standing, which is without contradiction the Church, which is Christ's body, "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." But how do we, as families, get into this body, this same good olive tree? St. Paul answers this question elsewhere. He says, 1 Cor. xii. 13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." The Spirit's power is the fatness of the olive tree, and unites truly those who are baptized with water with the good olive tree. Who, there-

fore, will deny a place to children in the good olive tree, when the promise is to us and to our children, the same blessed covenant that God made with Abraham, that in his seed should all the families of the earth be blessed? Is it not an everlasting covenant? Has it not been perpetuated by the children of the covenant? Where would there be a Church for the opposers of infant baptism to enter, if it had not been perpetuated by the children of the covenant? This, therefore, leads us to draw our next argument for infant baptism *from the sanction of the Holy Ghost*. It cannot be disputed successfully that the Church, the good olive tree, is born and perpetuated by the Holy Ghost. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Therefore every natural birth must have a spiritual birth in order to unite with the Church of God. But the Spirit operates through means in the hearts and minds of all intelligent creatures. To say, however, that the Holy Ghost cannot operate directly, without means, upon the heart and mind of a child, would be to limit His power and ability to save the souls of children who die in their infancy. But baptism is the sign for His operation in the heart and mind of a child. But as the heart and mind of a child develop by coming in contact with the external objects around them, as they reach forth to the thoughts and sentiments of the world, they at the same time must be brought under religious culture in order to the right kind of spiritual development,

otherwise the carnal influences around them will induce them to walk in the ways of sin. Hence, the Holy Ghost says: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it," Prov. xxii. 6. In what way would the Holy Ghost have a child to go? Certainly, in the way of His Church, which He has planted on the earth for the moral and religious training of mankind. This no one can successfully deny. Well, then, He would evidently have children start in their moral discipline in the Church as members. How could this training, to which the Holy Ghost alludes, take place out of the Church? But how would the Holy Ghost have us walk when we are old? Would He not have us to be faithful and constant members of His Church?

That the Holy Ghost sanctions infant baptism is proved from the fact that He has perpetuated the Church through the baptized children of the Church. Those who have been trained for Christ and His Church, are in possession of the Holy Ghost, which is evident from the fruits of the Spirit which they produce in their lives. If infant baptism were not acceptable to the Holy Ghost, would He bless the baptized children of the Church? Does not iniquity go down from parent to child, unto the third and fourth generation? But here we see a blessing going down from parent to child, from generation to generation, and therefore we conclude that infant baptism is acceptable to the Holy Ghost. We will

conclude under this head by quoting the language of Luther: "That the baptism of infants is pleasing and grateful to Christ is abundantly manifest from what He Himself has done, viz., because God has sanctified and made partakers of the Holy Spirit many of those who were baptized immediately after their birth. But there are many, also, at the present day, of whom we perceive that they have the Holy Spirit, as they give certain proofs of this, both in doctrine and life; just as by the grace of God there is granted to us the ability to interpret the Scriptures and know Christ, which every one knows to be impossible without the aid of the Holy Spirit. But if the baptism of children were not pleasing to Christ He would not give to any of them the Holy Spirit, nor even a particle of it; and, that I may say in a word what I think, there would not have been among men a single Christian through all the ages that have elapsed until the present day."

We may yet add the absence of all impediments to infant baptism. There is none on the part of God. "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish," Matt. xviii. 14. None on the part of the ministers, who can as readily give the baptismal washing, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to an infant as to an adult. There is no impediment on the part of the infant that receives the baptism. The infant mind and heart are as hidden as the invisible world of the future.

If it be said that the doctrine of *infant regeneration* is a profound mystery, and therefore *dubious*, we would only reply in the language of Jesus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and He also embraced infants in His declaration, when He said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh;" and if men with Nicodemus still say, "How can this be?" that it is unfathomable, then, with our Lord, we reply again, "So is it with every one that is born of the Spirit," John iii. 8.

There are also prophetic declarations in the Old Testament in regard to the New Testament Church, representing the whole family and especially children as partakers in it. Isaiah xlix. 22, has the following: "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders." That is, the children of the Gentiles are thine spiritually, and they shall bring to thee in their bosom and on their shoulders their children, which by God's grace shall be made thine.

CHAPTER XIV.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

WE will now proceed to answer the principal objections that have been offered to Infant Baptism.

Objection 1. Some opponents of infant baptism contend that the Abrahamic covenant is not the gospel, and therefore no argument based on that covenant for infant membership in the Church by baptism is valid.

The passage in Heb. viii. 8-12 has been sometimes quoted in order to show that the Abrahamic covenant has passed away, and that, therefore, the condition of infant membership, which was under that covenant, has also passed away, and that a new order of things has been established under the gospel. But let us read the passage: "For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in My covenant and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days,

saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know Me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

This is a quotation from Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34, Septuagint. The prophet announces here that the Mosaic covenant, the old Jewish economy, and especially its relative and hereditary provisions (see verses 29, 30) would be superseded by the gospel, or Abrahamic covenant, which would bring to us in reality what the former taught only in types and shadows.

And these beautiful words of the prophet are quoted by the apostle for the same purpose. Hence, the apostle says, "But now hath He (our Great High Priest) obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also He is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second," Heb. viii. 6, 7.

Here "the covenant established upon better promises" was the Abrahamic covenant, and by the phrase, "if the first covenant had been faultless," the apostle evidently means the Mosaic covenant, or the old Jewish economy.

In the connection in which the words stand in the prophet Jeremiah, they predict not only the gospel or Abrahamic covenant, but also its blessings to the Hebrew race. With this compare Romans xi. 25-32.

Now that by the *old* covenant is meant the Mosaic covenant, or the old Jewish economy, must be evident to every attentive reader of the passage in dispute. The new or Abrahamic covenant was not to be according to the covenant which the Lord made with the Israelites when He took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, which covenant was broken and all its conditions forfeited. He calls this covenant which He is about to make *new*, however, not in the sense of its being only a confirmatory renewal of the Abrahamic covenant, but in precise and express opposition to the covenant which was made on their removal from Egypt, namely, the Mosaic covenant, that it should be a new covenant not merely numerically, but also qualitatively.

Then follows a second principal idea. We are now told what was imperfect in the old or Mosaic covenant, and why there was need of the new or Abrahamic covenant, and wherein this should differ from the old or Mosaic. The principal defect in the old or Mosaic covenant lies in its inefficiency, which every Christian has demonstrated by actual experience. The reason is because sin is not removed by the old or Mosaic covenant, but only by it is sin brought to remembrance. As St. Paul says: "More-

over the law entered that the offence might abound," Rom. v. 20. Thus as the hearts of the people were not renewed, they continued not in the Mosaic covenant, and the Lord was under no obligations to have any regard for them.

In the Mosaic or old covenant, God's law was only written outwardly, as a cold requirement, on tables of stone; but in the new or Abrahamic, *i. e.*, the gospel covenant, the Lord has promised "to put His laws into our mind and to write them in our hearts," and thus that every one should know Him by blessed experience, the Lord being merciful to our unrighteousness and remembering our sins and our iniquities no more. All this will find its complete consummation in the millennial glory of Christ's reign, when Abraham's seed shall be as the sand on the sea-shore and as the stars of heaven innumerable.

That the prophet here foretells the consummation of the Abrahamic covenant under the gospel dispensation, must be evident to every reader of the New Testament who has experienced the regenerating grace of God in his mind and heart, which has brought light into his understanding and holiness into his will, by which he is enabled to serve God with a renewed disposition.

We here call attention to only a few of the many passages of Scripture under this head. "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham

and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant (the Abrahamic covenant), that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law (the Mosaic covenant), which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made," Gal. iii. 15-19.

It is seen from this that the Abrahamic covenant and the gospel are identical, and that the law was the old or Mosaic covenant, which served only a temporary purpose; but that the Abrahamic covenant was everlasting because it stood on the sure mercies of David (the Messiah).

Again, "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law (the Mosaic covenant), but through the righteousness of faith (the Abrahamic covenant). For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is after the law, but to that also which is of the faith

of Abraham, who is the father of us all," etc., Rom. iv. 13-17.

Now, St. Peter says to the repentant Jews: "For the promise (the Abrahamic covenant) is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," Acts ii. 39. God said to Abraham, "I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." Here we see that the Abrahamic covenant was everlasting. The believing Jew can claim forever of God such a relation to his children as Abraham had. St. Paul says, "They which are the children of the flesh (*i. e.*, children of Abraham according to the flesh, or by natural descent), "these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed," Rom. ix. 8. That is, the believing Gentiles, as the spiritual children of Abraham, can claim the same relation to their children under the Abrahamic covenant as the believing Jews had done; and now no less than to Abraham's natural posterity is the promise to his spiritual posterity. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," Gal. iii. 27-29.

God's covenant with Abraham was a charter of the perfect validity of the Church for all ages. "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed," Gal. iii. 8. This has never been annulled. Once given, it is perpetual. The identity of the Church with the Abrahamic covenant is further confirmed by verses 13 and 14 of the same chapter, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." What is the blessing of Abraham as here taught by the apostle? Not a blessing which Abraham would bestow upon his descendants, but the blessing which God bestowed upon Abraham when He counted or reckoned Abraham's faith for righteousness. Abraham was justified by faith; for justification, from an Evangelical standpoint, is that act of God by which He counts or reckons or declares our faith in Christ, for or in the place of righteousness. As St. Paul says, "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham," Gal. iii. 6, 7. This justifying faith in the believer's heart is produced by the Holy Spirit through the Word, and is testified to by

the same Spirit as genuine; as is said in the passage above, "That we might receive the promise of the Spirit (or the promised Spirit) through faith." The promised Spirit was sealed to Abraham and his descendants or to all believers in Christ by the stipulations of the Abrahamic covenant or the gospel. "And Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised: that righteousness might be imputed unto them also," Rom. iv. 11. But the sign of circumcision, or the seal of the righteousness of faith, was put upon Isaac when he was eight days old, by which God pledged to Abraham that his son should also receive the promised Spirit to work in him that faith by which alone he could be justified before God. And so it came to pass; for Isaac showed in the course of time that he was in possession of the same justifying faith that his father Abraham possessed; and so down to the generations following. As St. Paul says to the Church of the Ephesians, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," Eph. i. 13.

Now, it is admitted by our opponents, that baptism has come in the place of circumcision as the seal of the righteousness of faith, and therefore the blessing of Abraham or the promise of justify-

ing faith, wrought and sealed by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of our baptized children, is all the time in store for them in their baptism, whenever they shall choose to receive it, for the promise is unto us and to our children.

This promise guarantees a perpetual seed in whom this blessing is to remain, which is Christ, Gen. xvii. 7; Gal. iii. 16. As a seal of the covenant the Church before Christ had circumcision, and since Christ we have baptism, Gen. xvii. 9-14; Col. ii. 11, 12.

This blessing of Abraham, justification by faith, or the promised Spirit through faith, has been eternally perpetuated in the Christian Church, as is proved from the fact that we who were baptized in our infancy have received the promised Spirit.

Christ was a natural descendant of Abraham. That He is the medium through whom the blessing of Abraham is perpetuated, see Gal. iii. 16-18. Christ is the medium through whom we receive the blessing of Abraham, because evangelical faith holds Christ enclosed and has Him present in baptism. The covenant is thus with the seed of Abraham forever.

The nations of the earth come into this original covenant through this medium. The promise secured not only a perpetual seed, but a blessing to all nations through this seed. Those who believe in Christ are identical with Him in this covenant. In confirmation of this there are many sources of proof: (1) Gal. iii. 29. (2) This union by faith in

Christ makes them heirs of the same promise given to Abraham, Luke i. 32, 33; Rom. iv. 16; Gal. iii. 26-29. (3) Though the Mosaic ritual were annulled, this could never affect the everlasting covenant with Abraham, Gal. iii. 13, 14. (4) The immutability of this promise to all the seed is ratified and confirmed by the oath of Jehovah, Heb. vi. 13-18.

The conclusion follows that every Gentile believer has an interest in every promise and privilege which belongs to the grand charter of the Abrahamic covenant. An official recognition of the right of infant baptism would be but re-enacting a former principle. Allusions in the New Testament are corroborative of this conclusion—without it they *can have no significance*. These allusions are always consistent with the infant's right to the seal of the covenant. We have definite assertions that the kingdom of God or the Church includes infants, Matt. xix. 14. This is the best answer to those disciples who would have prevented the mothers in Israel from bringing their children to Christ, viz., That children had a place in His kingdom. The reason given for baptism is the old Abrahamic promise, and this is applicable also to children, Acts ii. 39.

At the Pentecost was the first open manifestation and outward action for advancing the superstructure of which Christ had laid the foundation. He commanded the disciples to remain at Jerusalem until the Spirit should be given to them. This first came on the day of Pentecost, Luke xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 2.

Those who reject infant baptism deny that "the promise unto you and to your children" was the Abrahamic promise. Such say that it was the prediction of Joel. In answer to this it may be said that Peter's discourse ended with verse 36. The allusion to the promise is in another connection, and in answer to the question, *What shall we do?* The prediction of Joel ii. 28-32, related to miraculous gifts at the time of setting up the gospel dispensation. *The promise* was to be applicable to all ages and all nations. But the promise also includes the Holy Spirit, as we have proved, Gal. iii. 14. The miraculous gifts were to give signal to the apostles that the time had come for their public labor, Acts i. 8. The other was the ground for administering baptism to *Jews*, and *Gentiles*. The persons addressed were Jews, who always spoke of and understood the Abrahamic covenant as *the promise*.

One believing parent gave to the children a right to the seal of the covenant in their consecration to God, 1 Cor. vii. 14. That there might not be any religious scruples, they were given to understand that the children of but one believing parent were not unclean.

The *phraseology*, "baptizing of households," is consistent only with this view, Acts xvi. 33; 1 Cor. i. 16. The faith of the head of the household is mentioned, and on that ground the household was received into the Church (*covenant*). This was *Jewish phraseology*.

The fact that the New Testament and all ecclesiastical history are silent in relation to any complaint of converted Jewish parents that the gospel excluded their children, is an evidence that the children of believers were admitted to baptism. This also shows that apostolic practice admitted them.

The seal in the Gospel Church was baptism instead of circumcision. Proof: Circumcision was directly abolished though the covenant remained, Acts xv. 22 to 29; 1 Cor. vii. 18-19; Gal. v. 1-4. Baptism was formally introduced by Christ as the sign of discipleship, Matt. xxviii. 19; and the apostles urged it upon the ground of the promise to Abraham. Baptized Gentiles were put on the same ground in the Christian Church as circumcised Jews, Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11. Both circumcision and baptism are put to denote a clean heart, thus denoting the same thing, Deut. xxx. 6; Col. ii. 11; John iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Circumcision was a seal of justifying faith in Christ, Rom. iv. 9 to 12; baptism is a pledge of the same thing, Gal. iii. 26-27. *Circumcision* and *baptism* are convertible terms and express the same state with Christ. Gentiles are not to be circumcised, but only baptized, and yet Abraham is the father of circumcision to all Gentile believers, Rom. iv. 12.

Objection 2. Infants cannot believe, therefore they should not be baptized.

(a) This objection is not psychologically true. The word *belief* in the objection means merely an intel-

lectual apprehension and understanding of the system of religion as taught in the sacred Scriptures. Infants cannot form a proper judgment of the divinity and humanity of Christ, of His death and resurrection, of the nature of sin and grace, therefore they cannot believe, nor indeed be saved. So we might infer from the objection.

It is true, our children have no knowledge of what takes place in their baptism; for they have yet no understanding of the nature of things. But does it therefore follow that nothing whatever transpires in them internally? Have they not the faculty of reason and conscience, have they not natural and moral susceptibility? Do not the germs of these things lie implanted in the new-born child? Who will mark the day in which the same will become active? The beginning of our inner spiritual life lies far beyond our understanding or comprehension. Even later in life, how much lies beyond the bounds of comprehension which has not yet entered into our spiritual life! The bounds of our comprehension or knowledge are much narrower than the sphere of our spiritual life. And manifold spiritual and moral developments do we experience without our fully comprehending them. "The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered," Rom. viii. 26. Who will, therefore, set bounds to the Spirit of God, over which He cannot go? He has His work in the soul of a child as well as in the soul of one who is grown up.

But this communion with God is yet especially to become a matter of consciousness. We therefore permit confirmation to follow baptism. Not in order to make baptism complete, for this it is already; not in order to renew it, for it is the beginning once for all; but that the baptized himself assume that on which he has been baptized, and that he express it with his own mouth; that the covenant of God in baptism be also a covenant of the understanding and will, and that he receive the blessing at once during the years of his moral development and his spiritual experience. With confirmation we combine the beginning of the Lord's Supper, and herewith the entrance into full communion in the Christian Church.

Luther says: "If the Word is connected with the water, baptism must be regarded as proper and valid, *even if faith is not connected with it*. For my faith does not constitute baptism, but it receives and apprehends it. Baptism is not vitiated or corrupted by men abusing it or not properly receiving it, for it is not bound to our faith, but to the Word of the Lord." The same is true with regard to the intention or opinion of the persons who administer it, and baptism, even by a heretic, if its essentials are retained, is not invalid.

To show further that the objection that children cannot believe and therefore should not be baptized, is not psychologically true, we will furnish the reader with two quotations, one from Dr. Jacobs, and another from Dr. Schaff.

Dr. Jacobs, in his very excellent book on the Elements of Religion, says: "The question whether infants can be regenerated is the same as whether infants can have faith. If everything that characterizes the faith of adults be regarded essential to faith, *i. e.*, if faith at an advanced stage of development be made the universal test of faith, we cannot ascribe it to infants. The scholastics laid great emphasis on the intellectual side of faith. "To believe," says Thomas Aquinas, "implies the consideration of the intellect, combined with examination and consent on the part of the will." "To believe is an act of the intellect assenting to divine truth, arising from a determination of the will impelled by grace." This means that faith can exist only as a truth is presented to the intellect, and to which after deliberation, inquiry and examination, the will determines to assent. The Reformers were especially emphatic in maintaining that this conception overlooked the most important element of faith, *viz.*, confidence. The dogmaticians accordingly added "confidence" and analyzed the entire conception of faith into the three elements of knowledge, assent and confidence. But since where there is no confidence there is no faith, knowledge and assent do not belong to the essence of faith. They are the prerequisites of a mature faith. They are inevitably found where there is faith in a doctrine. I cannot, in the proper sense, believe a doctrine unless I have been taught what it is, and assented to it, and then

determine that my life shall be regulated according to it. Such faith in the doctrines of revelation will be the necessary result of faith in the person who reveals them. But the essence of faith given in regeneration is confidence or trust in a person. It is that temper or disposition of the heart towards God by which the person is rendered capable of receiving whatever God offers, and of responding to every word of God through new powers wherewith God has endowed him.

Infants are, therefore, incapable of acts of faith, although they have a habit of faith; just as they are incapable of acts of sin, although they have, in natural depravity or original sin, a sinful habit. We say that men have an innate knowledge of God. By this we do not mean that they are conscious of the existence and presence of God, and of any relations in which they stand to Him, but only that the human mind is endowed with faculties that inevitably draw the conclusion of the existence and of certain attributes of God from the contemplation of nature. In like manner we claim that when, on the basis of certain texts of Scripture, we teach the possibility of infant regeneration, the faith that is therein said to be wrought must correspond to other determinations of their spiritual nature. The faith of infants is like the knowledge and sin of infants. The actual presence is not disproved by the fact that it is not consciously present. The faith may lie dormant, like the words of Christ to the apostles,

until the Holy Spirit recalled them, or like the attainments of a scholar while he is sleeping.”

Dr. Schaff, in his “History of the Apostolic Church,” on the same point, says: “But now, as to the second proposition of the Baptist argument, the incapacity of children for faith, whence follows their exclusion from baptism: this is granted, if by faith we understand a *self-conscious, free* turning of the heart to God. This cannot take place till the dawn of intelligence (for which, by the way, no certain period can be fixed), and in view of this, infant baptism needs to be completed in the subject, according to ancient usage, by catechetical instruction and confirmation, in which the Christian, arrived at the age of spiritual discretion, ratifies his baptismal confession and of his free determination gives himself to God. For this reason also the baptism of the children of unbelieving, though nominally Christian, parents, is in reality unmeaning, or rather a profanation of the holy transaction; since there is here a hypocritical profession of faith and no guarantee of an education answering to the baptismal vow. But the grand error of the proposition before us is that the conception of faith in general, and with it the agency of the Holy Ghost, is limited to and made to depend on a particular stage of the development of the human mind, and that the various forms and phases of divine operation and of faith are overlooked. The ground and condition of salvation lie not at all in the subject or creature, but in the

depths of the divine mercy; and in faith itself we must observe different stages, from the germ to the perfect fruit. Faith begins with religious susceptibility, with an unconscious longing for the divine, and a childlike trust in a higher power. It is not a product of human thought, understanding, feeling, or will, but a work of the grace and of the Spirit of God, who is bound to no age or degree of intelligence, but operates as the wind blows, when and where He will. Faith does not produce the blessings of salvation, but simply receives them, and only in this respect, as a receptive, not a productive organ, is it saving; otherwise, salvation would be a work of the creature.

Now this receptivity for the divine, or faith in its incipient form and slumbering germ, may be found in the child even purer than in the adult. In virtue of its religious constitution and endowments the child is susceptible to the influence of grace and may be actually regenerated. If a man deny this he must, to be consistent, condemn all children without exception to perdition. For they, like all men, are conceived in sin (Ps. li. 5), flesh born of flesh (John iii. 6), and by nature the children of wrath (Eph. ii. 3; comp. Rom. iii. 22-24); and except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, according to our Lord's unequivocal declaration, he cannot enter the kingdom of God (Jno. iii. 5). "He that believeth not shall be damned," Mark xvi. 16. When Baptists and some other theologians, therefore, admit at least

some infants into heaven without regeneration or faith, they either deny original sin and guilt after the manner of Pelagianism or open a way of salvation unknown, nay, directly opposed, to the gospel. There are also, however, explicit passages in the Scriptures which have no doubt respecting the capacity of childhood and infancy for the divine. Not to mention the extraordinary case of John the Baptist, who even in his mother's womb was filled with the Holy Ghost, Luke i. 15-41. We know from Matt. xviii. 2-5; xix. 14-15; Mark x. 14-15; Luke xviii. 16-17, that the Saviour Himself took children into His arms, blessed them, and adjudged them meet for the kingdom of heaven; nay, He required also adults to become children again, to cultivate the simple, unassuming, confiding, susceptible disposition of the child, if they would have part in that kingdom. Should the Church refuse baptism, that is the sign and seal of entrance into Christ's kingdom, to the tender age which the Lord Himself pressed to His loving heart? Should she hold off from her communion as incapable and unworthy the infants whom the Head of the Church presented even as models to all who would be His disciples? Rather must we conclude from this, strange as it may appear, that *every baptism, even in the case of adults, is really an infant baptism*, because Christ makes the childlike spirit an indispensable condition of entrance into His kingdom, and because baptism in general, as the sacrament of regeneration, de-

mands of every candidate the renunciation of his former sinful life in repentance, and the beginning of a *new*, holy life in faith."

(*b*) The objection is not in accordance with the Scriptures and therefore is of no force. We are told by St. Paul that the children of Israel were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, 1 Cor. x. 2. Were there any children baptized unto Moses? Most assuredly. But did these understand the nature of their baptism unto Moses? They were taught this relation as they were brought under the divine tuition. They were baptized first, then taught, as is done in the Christian church.

All this the apostle says is an allegory of baptism in the Christian Church. "These things were our examples." But if the baptizing of these children unto Moses does not find its type in infant baptism, in what other thing shall we find its answer in the Christian Church? If children could be baptized unto Moses, what shall hinder them from being baptized unto Christ? If those children were baptized unto Moses, on the faith of their parents, who shall hinder the children of Christian parents from being baptized on the faith of their parents? Is not the salvation of our children as near and dear to us as Christian parents as was the salvation of the Hebrew children to their parents? The desire of infant baptism springs, first of all, from the need of regarding the children of Christian parents as belonging to Christ, not merely on the ground of the will of the

Church but of Christ Himself, and of regarding the age of childhood as consecrated and hallowed by Christ, who lived through and hallowed all the periods of our life. On this point Dr. Dorner says most beautifully: "The natural bonds between parents and children are not reduced to insignificance in Christianity, but acknowledged in their importance, as was done even in the Old Testament by circumcision. These bonds are not simply left by Christian parents to their quiet unconscious influence, but contain a definite hint to them that they should present their children to Christ, nay, that through them God wishes their children brought into the number of Christ's disciples, a sign of His grace directed toward children. This may be gathered from 1 Cor. vii. 14, and Old Testament circumcision. This natural connection involves the duty, and therefore the right, of parents to present their children to Christ. To say in objection that consecration in reference to children is already implied in the natural connection, and that baptism is therefore needless for them, would be to attach more importance to the bond of nature connecting children with Christian parents, and thus indirectly with Christ, than to a direct bond of union with Christ. But the former view would only be sufficient on the supposition of parents ascribing the power of consecration to *themselves*. On the other hand, the more that parents and the Church are conscious of their needy condition and dependence on Christ, the more

must they go back in behalf of their children, not to their own substitutionary consecration, but to Christ's alone sufficient substitution, seek His blessing and cling to its expression in the baptism of the Lord's own institution, which of itself points to Christ's substitutionary death and life. All the more have Christian parents the right to seek Christ's blessing and consecration, as the presenting of their children accords with His mind; for He did not reject the parents who presented their children to Him, that He might touch them, lay His hands on them and pray for them, as if He could do nothing with them, or they had nothing to do with Him, but He said: 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God,' and He had compassion on them, laid His hands upon them and blessed them. This blessing and reception into His love might take the place of baptism to them. Thus, then, the Church in conformity with His institution offers itself to Him as an organ for the continuance of His purpose, that through its hands He may baptize the little ones and take them into His arms as His possession. The Church cannot be poorer than the Synagogue; the new covenant cannot express less love than the covenant of circumcision, whose benefit applied also to children. The first sermon of Peter alludes to this. At the same time, the natural fellowship of the parents renders this service, that their recollection of the child's baptism is a substitute for the

child's own knowledge, and in due time this knowledge is communicated to the child after self-consciousness is awakened."

Again, the Psalmist says: "Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts," Ps. xxii. 9. The idea is that from his earliest years he had been led to trust in God; and he now pleads this fact as a reason why He should interpose to save him. Applied to the Redeemer as a man, it means that in His earliest childhood He had trusted in God. His first breathings were those of piety. His first aspirations were for the divine favor. His first love was the love of God. If the infant Jesus hoped when He was on His mother's breasts, who will say that He was not a believer then? If you place the infant Jesus among the unbelievers, where are you? But the Holy Ghost has given us the proof that Jesus was then among the believers by the sign of the covenant which was placed upon Him.

But if the Holy Ghost made Jesus hope upon His mother's breasts, may He not do the same with all the children that are consecrated to Him in holy baptism? That He has to do with children in this respect may be proved from Psalm viii. 2: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength because of Thine enemies, that Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." This passage is quoted by the Saviour in Matthew xxi. 16, to vindicate the conduct of the children in the temple crying, "Hosanna to the Son of David,"

against the objections of the Pharisees and Scribes. Jesus said unto them, "Have ye not read, out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise?" If God has perfected praise out of the mouth of babes and sucklings, who will say against the witness of Jesus, that children baptized into the Trinity do not belong to the believers? If they were reckoned with unbelievers, would their praise be the most perfect in the ears of God? Be assured, Christian parents, that your children baptized sustain a much nearer relation to God and the Church than the opposers of infant baptism imagine.

We, also, here call attention to Matt. xviii. 6: "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." The context and all go to show that the Saviour had little children here in view, when He uttered these precious words, for He had called a little child to Him, and had set him in the midst of His disciples. At any rate, this passage is as applicable to little children as it is to weak adult believers. For the Saviour, by this circumstance, has evidently placed little children among the believers, and therefore the objection to their baptism on this ground is invalid. It is about time that this objection, therefore, to infant baptism, be laid aside, for it is exceedingly weak, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

(c.) The objector's own practice refutes him. He says you must not baptize children, because they do

not believe (which he has not proved, and cannot prove), yet he often baptizes adults who do not believe. Luther says: "This is a nice point." When, however, adults, who are not really believers, like Simon Magus (Acts viii. 21), at the time of their baptism, become awakened afterwards and become true believers, they have no need of being re-baptized, for their baptism is valid. But our objectors do not re-baptize such. Why, therefore, will these objectors not make their objections correspond with their own practice?

We once asked one of the River Brethren, who are also Tunkers, "How do you River Brethren differ from the regular Tunkers?" To this he replied, "We believe more in heart religion than the Tunkers. We want experimental religion. We go in more for the spiritual work. The regular Tunkers baptize unbelievers." However much truth there might be in this statement about the regular Tunkers, we asked the same person, "Whether they did not also sometimes get unbelievers into the Church by their baptism?" To this he replied, "It is only too true."

Objection 3. How can parents believe for their children? It is looked upon as settled by these objectors that parents cannot believe for their children in holy baptism

In answer to this objection, we say that parents must believe for their children in feeding them, in clothing them, in educating them; why not then

also in making disciples of them? When your child is sick you believe a certain kind of food will help it, and you administer the food. What does the child know what is food or what is poison? Why so alarmed about its life when it happens to get hold of poison? Why not leave it to its natural instinct? You, however, say no, the child must not in such a case be left to itself. Its life would be in danger; you must believe for it in such a case.

But is not the spiritual life of the child just as much in danger of the spiritual poison, which is in every place where its eyes rest? The soul must be educated or "exercised to discern both good and evil." To this the Lord alludes, when He says: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it," Prov. xxii. 6. In what way would you have your child go? In the way of sin, in the broad way, or in the narrow way? If you would have him go in the narrow way, why not take him with you in the covenant of grace, and train him up in the way of the Church? We have the divine assurance that the early training for the Church will be abundantly blessed by the Lord. It is nothing but unbelief that keeps children from the baptism of the Church, to which they have just as good a title, if not better, than adult believers; for they are put by the Saviour on the same ground, and besides they have a special call. "Christianity, which is the absolute religion, embracing within itself all religious truth and power, finds its most perfect

expression in infant baptism. In the same way, in it the nature of prevenient grace is set in the clearest light. In infant baptism the Church opposes the notion that Christian grace does not hold good for childhood. Children are indeed but imperfect Christians, but still they are Christians, because Christ has received them. In virtue of Christ's all-embracing purpose of grace, *the individual* within Christendom has a right to claim that no portion of his life shall be outside Christianity. This is secured to him by infant baptism."

And if you are anxious that your children should be clothed with comfortable and beautiful garments, why not also provide for them the means by which they may secure the garment of righteousness? Do they not need such a garment? "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." They must be born also of the Spirit. Is it more likely that they will secure the Spirit without baptism than with baptism? The baptism of the Spirit is mentioned by Jesus after baptism with water. Here are His words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John iii. 5. Jesus Himself was first baptized with water, and then He received the baptism of the Spirit, Matt. iii. 16.

But the Saviour Himself has commanded us to make disciples of our children by baptizing, as we have seen in the great commission. If He had meant that children should be excluded, He would

most assuredly have said so; but His silence in this respect is proof of the strongest kind that it was His good will and pleasure that they should be included in the commission with their parents, and so we understand it.

Besides, we are commanded to consecrate all we have and all we are to the Lord. Here is the command: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service," Rom. xii. 1. Does this mean that we should consecrate everything to God but our children? There is no exception; the command includes the body and all its fruits. Are not our children the fruits of our bodies? Do we not pray for our children? Do we not carry them on supplicating hearts? How can we do this without believing for them? But if they have no part in the covenant, how can we pray and believe for them?

The woman of Canaan believed for her little daughter, who was "grievously vexed with a devil." Yet the mother prayed unto Him, saying, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou Son of David." It was the mother's cause as well as the daughter's. It is likely that the little daughter did not even know that the mother had gone to Jesus to get her cured, but she learned this afterwards whence help came against the evil spirit which tormented her. For the Lord at length honored most graciously the mother's faith, when He said to her, "O woman,

great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour."

The nobleman of Capernaum also believed for his child, John iv. 50. Jesus said to him, "Go thy way; thy son liveth."

Are not our children also afflicted with the devil when they show evil dispositions arising in them from which, unless they be delivered, they will finally fall under his power? Satan seeks to destroy our children, and will destroy them if they grow up without religious culture such as is received in the training of the Christian Church in baptism. We cannot look after the spiritual welfare of our children too soon. But if you do not believe that Jesus has any regard for your children, you will not bring them to Him. The unbelief is not on the side of the children, but on the side of the neglectful parents. If our children are finally lost, whose fault is it? If we would bring them to Jesus, as the woman of Canaan and the nobleman of Capernaum, how our children would be found walking in the truth!

But Baptists contend on Pelagian grounds, that infants are saved by their innocence, and without regeneration. Lutherans contend and maintain that infants are saved as sinful beings for Christ's sake, and after renewal by the Holy Spirit, who is offered in baptism, in which they are to be nurtured by the Church.

We conclude our discussion on Infant Baptism

with another quotation from the immortal Luther: "Now," says Luther, "if baptism can remain right and complete, though the Christian fall from faith or commit sin a thousand times in a year; and if it is sufficient for him to reform himself again in a proper manner and believe, and it be unnecessary for him to be rebaptized; why should not the first baptism also be sufficient and right, if the Christian afterwards becomes right and believes? For there is no difference in a baptism without faith, since it is equally void of faith, whether there be no experience of faith before or after the administration. If it is without faith, it must, as the Anabaptists foolishly pretend, be altered according to the expression, 'He that believeth.'

"I assert, therefore, that even if these opposers could prove their position, that children are destitute of faith, which we have shown to be false, they would still have established nothing more by their contention, than that the true baptism, which God has instituted, was not received rightly, but in spirit of abuse. Yet he who proves nothing more than abuse, proves no more indeed than that the abuse must be remedied, and not the ceremony must be repeated. For abuse alters the nature of nothing. Gold does not become straw, if a thief steals and abuses it. Silver does not become paper, if a usurer unjustly gains it."

PART III.
FEET-WASHING.

CHAPTER XV.

FEET-WASHING—NOT A SACRAMENT.

THERE are some persons who contend that Feet-Washing is a Christian Sacrament or ordinance, binding on all generations of Christians, like Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church; and that whoever neglects Feet-Washing in the public assemblies of the Church, is guilty of violating the commandment of the Lord, where He says: "Ye call Me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you," John xiii. 13-15.

The principal argument for feet-washing as a Christian Sacrament, to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church, is based on the *literal* interpretation of these words of our blessed Lord. If these words are to be taken in their literal aspect as separated from the *time* and *occasion* when they were delivered, there could perhaps be but one conclusion. But in our interpretation of this passage of Scripture we must take into consideration the time

and occasion when it was delivered. Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture. "Comparing spiritual things with spiritual," 1 Cor. ii. 13.

If all the commands of Christ to His first disciples, who were Jews, were binding on us Gentile Christians, we should have a hard time indeed. We would all have to become Jews. For example: "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not," Matt. xxiii. 2, 3. The tendency of some of the sects of the present day has, indeed, a Judaizing cast in their interpretation of Christian doctrine and practice. But we have one grand decision by the first Apostolic Council against all such Judaizing tendency in the Christian Church. It is found in the Acts of the Apostles, xv. 23-29: "And they wrote letters by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia: Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment: it seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the

same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." The Holy Ghost does not lay unnecessary burdens, such as the Jews imposed upon themselves, upon the Gentile Christians. This Apostolic letter shows that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink: but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in those things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men," Rom. xiv. 17, 18.

Let us mention a few commandments which, separated from their contexts, are just as explicit as that on Feet-washing, when separated from its context.

Jesus said: "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one," Luke xxii. 36. From the explicit and positive form of these words, the disciples supposed at first that the Saviour meant swords, and that He commanded them to furnish themselves with literal swords; and His words literally interpreted, from their connection, imply it. For the disciples answered: "Lord, behold, here are two swords." But did the Saviour really mean that His words should be taken in their literal import, separated from the time and occasion when they were uttered? Most assuredly not. He and

His disciples were then in the garden of Gethsemane, and He by this command gave His disciples warning of the coming danger; for He knew what was coming. As if He would say: "If any will travel through the dangers before him and is destitute of a sword for defence, it were better to sell his very cloak and buy a sword, than go unarmed. For I assure you that this Scriptural intimation has yet to be accomplished in My case."

"E'en yields He to be reckoned with the vile,
In infamy by many, in doom by Heaven."

Yes, every minute prediction concerning the Messiah is to be fully verified. "Master," said the disciples, who had been searching among their garments for weapons, "here are two swords." "Never mind about supplying yourselves literally with arms," returned He; "that will do on that subject."

This command, therefore, to buy swords, as is proved by the disregard of Christ for the two weapons actually produced by His disciples, as well as by His pacificatory conduct on the use of one of them (Matt. xxvi. 52, "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"), was only designed as a general intimation of the hazards to which they would soon be exposed. But this intelligent conclusion could not be reached if the command to buy a sword were separated from its Scriptural connection. Scripture *must* be explained by Scripture.

Again "Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. Go not from house to house," Luke x. 4-7. Have we not here commandments as direct and explicit as that on Feet-washing? If you take these as literal commands to us, then it is wrong for a Christian missionary to carry a purse, or satchel, or shoes. Over against this literal arbitrary interpretation of the Scriptures, time, climate and circumstances avail nothing, for here are the commands of the Lord. How far could a traveling missionary get nowadays in his work if he would interpret these commands literally? We had this very argument once used against us by a certain person in our efforts to collect missionary money. The fellow took the Saviour's words literally. Suppose such a one should enter the cars at some station, with a distant point in view, and the conductor should come around to collect the fare, what would be the answer? Would the missionary say, "Mr. Conductor, I am a minister of the Gospel, and I am on my way to the most distant point on your road, but as my Master has commanded me to provide neither purse, nor satchel, nor shoes, you perceive I am not able to pay my fare." At the next station that missionary would very likely find himself put off the cars, with the reply of a literal command from the same Lord, "Thou shalt not steal." But suppose the missionary were really sane, he would then be compelled to travel on foot, over all roads and in all weather. But how could he do this in all cli-

mates without shoes? What, also, would he do for a change of linen, if he were not permitted to carry a satchel? And what about saluting people by the way? He would not even be permitted to kiss any of his brethren by the way, for the command is literally, "*Salute no man by the way.*" How many are breaking this commandment by the way! They have become so hardened on this subject of salutation that they even salute their brethren by the way, when their Master has explicitly told them, "*Salute no man by the way.*" The white brethren do not seem to have any conscience, except in case of the *black* brethren, on this subject. What a dreadful world this is getting to be!

But what about this: "Go not from house to house?" If this should be literally carried out, what would those people say who want their pastors to be going from house to house all the time?

It must be plain therefore, that many of the Saviour's commandments to His immediate disciples are not of universal or literal application. So with the pretended command of Feet-washing as a religious ordinance of the Church.

In the above case the Lord meant that the people among whom they labored should furnish them all the necessary things; for He adds, "The workman is worthy of his meat," Matt. x. 10.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE LANGUAGE EMPLOYED.

The nature and form of the language employed in the passage under consideration, is really not in the form of a *positive* command. If this point can be made out, then the very foundation of this pretended sacrament of Feet-washing will be destroyed; for all sacraments must rest on the positive commands of the Lord. But this point will be more fully discussed further on in the argument.

Let us, then, here carefully examine the language of the text under consideration: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet." The Lord here places this matter of Feet-washing wholly on *moral* grounds, not on a *positive* command. The language is that of moral reasoning. If he is willing to take the place of a servant, why should not they? "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord," Matt. x. 24. It was the duty of one of them to take the place of a servant, to wash the feet of the guests, already reclining on couches around the table smoking with the Paschal Supper, but their proud altercation about pre-eminence, just

as they were about to take their relative positions, would not allow such condescension. But in the midst of the delay the Master Himself arose, laid aside His garments, took a towel, girded Himself, poured water into a basin, and washed the disciples' feet, all in the form of a servant. Then, said He, after resuming His place at the table, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." You see He puts the matter wholly on *moral* grounds, not on a positive command. There are *positive* ordinances and *moral* observances: the positive resting alone on the authority of the lawgiver; the moral growing out of the nature and fitness of things. Take some of the positive commandments, for illustration, as enumerated by St. Paul: "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet." These are all *positive*, but throw them into a *moral* form, and see the difference: "Thou oughtest not to kill, Thou oughtest not to steal, Thou oughtest not to bear false witness, Thou oughtest not to covet." This would put the whole matter on moral grounds or the fitness of things.

God, as the moral legislator, has established positive institutions which are valid through all time. They are the Church, the Sacraments (Baptism and the Lord's Supper), the Sabbath, Family and Civil Government; but Feet-washing, as a sacrament, rests on no positive legislation.

But the Saviour, in the language employed, "If I then," etc., speaks of a *moral* duty growing out of the nature and fitness of things, out of the relation of Master and disciples. Who would ever suppose a *positive* institution to be established by an "*If?*" There are no *ifs* in the decalogue; there are none in Baptism; there are none in the Lord's Supper. But in this pretended sacrament of Feet-washing there is an "*If*," "If I then," etc.

But the advocates of Feet-washing as a sacrament will find as little help in the word *ought*. *Ought* implies moral duty or obligation. St. Paul says: "We that are strong *ought* to bear the infirmities of the weak," Rom. xv. i. *Ought* is spoken of what the circumstances of time, place, persons, and relations render proper or fit. On this point Olshausen says: "After completing the process, the Redeemer again reclined at the Supper, and instructed His disciples concerning the import of what He had done. He speaks first of the subordinate relation in which they themselves acknowledged that they stood to Him. (The names *disciples* and *Master*, according to the Rabbinical view, denote the relation of learners to teachers, which involved the obligation upon the former to serve the latter.) Hence it would follow that it was *their* duty to serve *Him*; nevertheless, *He* had ministered to *them* from condescending love."

Besides, how could the Saviour have said, "*Ye ought*," in this case, if the whole matter was not resting on *moral* grounds? If Feet-washing had then

for the first time been instituted as a Christian sacrament, how could the disciples have violated a commandment before it was promulgated? "Where no law is, there is no transgression," Rom. iv. 15. It is admitted that Feet-washing by the Saviour was accomplished before He spoke the words under consideration. Look at the context: "So after He had washed their feet, and had taken His garments, and was set down again, He said unto them, Know ye what I have done? Ye call Me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then," etc. How, therefore, could He as a just Saviour have accused His disciples of violating a commandment, if it is a commandment, before it was promulgated?

Therefore since Christ has based His appeal to His disciples, that they "also ought to wash one another's feet," on moral grounds, on the relation which they as learners sustained to Him as teacher, as something growing out of the nature of things, His washing the disciples' feet must be regarded as an illustration of some moral principle, which they had just been violating. What principle was this? It was the principle of humility. Humility is a moral duty. The servant is not above his lord.

Let us here see what Dr. Hickok says, in his *Moral Science*, about this virtue of humility: "Humility, in its true meaning, is a virtue that proportions itself relatively in the being that exercises it. To all finite beings, humility is a duty and a virtue. It consists in the assent of a person to take the pre-

cise position which is due to his own proportional intrinsic excellency. We speak not now of the humility of a sinner, which must partake of shame and remorse, but the humility of spiritual beings in the presence of the Absolute Jehovah, as a moral virtue. Whatever grades of spiritual life there may be from human to archangel, through all the ranks of "thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers," that is humility which, in reverent adoration of the Most High, cordially assents to its own place among the worshipers, and the highest in the classified ranks, while he casts his crown before the throne, and veils his face with his wings, will be as truly virtuous in his humility as the lowest. The righteous order would be as truly broken in the degradation of the higher as in the undue exaltation of the lower, and each is truly humble and morally virtuous in his humility, when he bows rejoicingly before God in the very place which his relative excellency assigns to him. There is no pride, no self-conceit, but the virtue of universal liberty, in that world where God is too great to be either proud or humble, and where all finite being fills just the sphere of its own spiritual excellence with divine adoration and praise."

Christ's language implies that He was, in this act of washing the disciples' feet, illustrating the sublime moral principle of humility: "For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." This corresponds with that other beautiful

passage in Phil. ii. 5-11: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

How absurd, therefore, the strife of the Apostles about pre-eminence in the presence of such a being, the Holy One and the Just! And deeply must they have felt humbled when they saw their sublime Master and Lord condescend to perform a duty which they ought to have done! No wonder Peter exclaimed, "Lord, dost Thou wash my feet?" Jesus replied, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." Peter learned the lesson by his great fall and restoration. After this he could write, "Be clothed with humility," 1 Pet. v. 5.

This moral principle of humility, therefore, the disciples had violated by their strife, and hence Christ's act of washing their feet and of His subsequent admonition. Therefore as Christ has placed all this on moral grounds, Feet-washing cannot be a

sacrament established by Christ, to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church throughout all generations of Christians.

And this for the following reasons:

1. Feet-washing contains none of the elements of a sacrament. The elements necessary to constitute a sacrament are three: the *natural* element, the *spiritual* element, and the *Divine command*. Try by this rule the sacraments about which there is no dispute. Take the Sacrament of Baptism. In this we have water, which is the natural element; the words of the institution, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," which is the spiritual element; and the Divine command, "Go," etc. Take next the Lord's Supper. The natural element is bread and wine; the spiritual element, "This is My body," "This is My blood;" and the Divine command, "Do this." But when we come to examine this pretended sacrament of Feet-washing, we shall find that it lacks all these elements. We have already shown that the admonition of the Saviour is placed on moral grounds, growing out of the nature and fitness of things, and out of the moral relations which the disciples as learners sustained to Jesus as their Master, and not on a positive commandment that we as Gentile Christians should wash one another's feet in the public assemblies of the Church. Feet-washing has also no words of institution; no Divine formula of holy words is given, as in the two sacraments men-

tioned. It has no element but water. But water in itself cannot constitute a sacrament.

On this point Luther says: "Indeed it is true the two parts (the natural and the heavenly elements) belong to a sacrament, but still they are not sufficient by themselves to constitute a sacrament—one thing more belongs to it, that we may have the Trinity in full, namely the Divine injunction and command. If you can establish this, that the Divine Majesty in heaven says, "I have ordained and enjoined it," then these two parts are quite sufficient and competent to be denominated a sacrament. But if not, everything which we could possibly imagine, as I have said, might become a sacrament."

Learned theologians say: "There is required for a sacrament (1) that it must be an act commanded by God; (2) it must have a visible element Divinely prescribed (united with the celestial object through the medium of the words of institution (Holl. 1054); (3) it must have the promise of evangelical grace."—(*Schmid*, p. 543.)

Neither tried by this rule does Feet-washing hold as a divinely appointed sacrament. It has no words of institution; it has no divine command, and it does not contain evangelical grace, or the pardon of sin. Therefore Feet-washing is no sacrament to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVED.

WE come now to inquire into the circumstances involved in the case of our Lord's washing the disciples' feet. This will involve two propositions:

First. That this Feet-washing took place at the celebration of the Jewish Legal Passover;

Second. That Feet-washing was a Jewish custom, long established before the occasion under consideration, and associated with the celebration of the Paschal Supper.

It will require a good deal of patient investigation to bring out the truth of these two propositions, but with their establishment the purported sacrament of Feet-washing falls to the ground, as in the former case.

First, That this Feet-washing took place at the celebration of the Jewish Legal Passover. In the discussion of this proposition we will have to show that this Feet-washing, mentioned in John xiii. 4-17, took place at the celebration of the Jewish Legal Passover. For this we have the inspired testimony of three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke. Where, then, were Christ and His disciples when

the purported sacrament of Feet-washing was instituted? They were in Jerusalem, in a large upper room well furnished and prepared, celebrating the regular Jewish Passover.

Matthew says: "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the passover? And He said, Go into the city to such a man and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with My disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them, and they made ready the passover. Now when the even was come He sat down with the twelve," Matt. xxvi. 17-20.

Mark says: "And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, His disciples said unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare that Thou mayest eat the passover? And He sendeth forth two of His disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the good man of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with My disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us. And His disciples went forth and came into the city and found as He had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. And in the evening He cometh with the twelve," Mark xiv. 12-17.

Luke says: "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the passover. Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. And they said unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we prepare? And He said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in. And ye shall say unto the good man of the house, the Master saith unto thee, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with My disciples? And he shall show you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. And they went, and found as He had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. And when the hour was come He sat down, and the twelve apostles with Him," Luke xxii. 7-14.

The day when the disciples came to Jesus and asked Him, "Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare, that Thou mayest eat the passover?" was preparation day for the Paschal Supper, which was the 14th day of Nisan, the first month in the Jewish sacred year. This, according to Dr. Strong's Harmony, was Christ's preparation for His fourth passover. It occurred on a Thursday.

The last supper that Christ celebrated with His disciples, shortly before His death, was, therefore, according to the testimony of Matthew, Mark and Luke, the Jewish Legal Passover. Upon this divine

testimony will we rest this argument, and the gates of Hell will not be able to overthrow it.

Is it asked, what was the Jewish Legal Passover? It was a feast ordained by God in commemoration of the miraculous deliverance of the children of Israel from the angel, who destroyed the first-born in every Egyptian family, when he passed over the houses of the Israelites, on whose door-posts and lintels he discovered the blood of the Paschal Lamb, Ex. xii. 1-8.

According to this, the Paschal Lamb was slain on the evening of the 14th of the month Nisan. It must be remembered, in this connection, that the Jewish day commenced in the evening at 6 o'clock, according to our time of reckoning.

The Paschal Lamb was regularly killed between the 9th and 11th hour; that is, between 3 and 5 o'clock, P. M., on the 14th of Nisan (Jos. B. J. 6, 9, 3; Robinson's Greek Lex., p. 538).

The Jews reckoned two evenings as marking the portion of the day during which the Paschal Lamb was to be killed, Ex. xii. 6; Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. ix. 3, 5. According to these passages, the 14th of Nisan was really only the preparation, when the house-cleaning and the removing of the leaven took place; and when the Paschal Lamb, unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs were prepared.

The later Jews made some additions; in particular they drank at intervals during the Paschal Supper four cups of red wine usually mingled with one-

fourth part of water. The third cup was called the cup of blessing, 1 Cor. x. 16; Comp. Matt. xxvi. 27.

In the New Testament the passover is spoken of as the victim, the supper, and the festival. On this point Luke says: "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the passover," Luke xxii. 1. So also Josephus: "Now, upon the approach of the feast of unleavened bread, which the law of their fathers had appointed for the Jews at this time, which feast is called the passover," etc. Jos. Antiq. xvii. 9, 3.

This is a very important point to be remembered in this discussion; for while the word passover literally applies merely to the eating of the Paschal Lamb on the night of the 15th Nisan, which was really the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, yet the name, by way of accommodation, was applied to the whole feast, including the 14th, which was the day of preparation, and also the following seven days, making the feast eight days in all. This is also according to Josephus, where he says: "As now the war abroad ceased for a while, the sedition within was revived; and on the feast of unleavened bread, which was now come, it being the fourteenth day of the month Xanthius (Nisan)," etc. "They offered the sacrifice which is called the passover, on the fourteenth day of the same month (Nisan), and feasted seven days," etc. Again, "Whence it is that, in memory of the want we were then in, we kept a feast for eight days, which is called the feast of unleavened bread," Jos. A. J. 2, 15, 1.

These quotations from Luke and Josephus are sufficient to prove that the period of eight days, from the 14th of Nisan to the 21st of the same month, inclusive, was called the feast of unleavened bread; and that the word passover, in a popular way, is applied to all this time, while really the eating of the Paschal Lamb or the passover took place on the 15th of Nisan. The Paschal Lamb was slain on the 14th of Nisan, between 3 and 5 o'clock, toward the end of the Jewish day. The 14th of Nisan was a Thursday, Matt. xxvi. 17. "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the passover?" This was the day of preparation, which was properly reckoned in the feast of unleavened bread. On the evening of the 14th of Nisan at 6 o'clock, which was also the beginning of the 15th of Nisan, came the feast of passover itself, when what was prepared was eaten.

On the evening of that day, before 6 o'clock, and thus at the transition from the 14th to the 15th of Nisan, the Legal Passover was introduced with FEET-WASHING.

CHAPTER XVIII.

FEET-WASHING A JEWISH CUSTOM.

THIS brings us to the discussion of that other proposition: That Feet-washing was a Jewish custom, long established before the occasion under consideration, and associated with the celebration of the Paschal Supper.

The *antiquity* of Feet-washing as a Jewish custom is very easily established by the Scriptures, for the ancient people, in the warmer climates, wash their feet frequently. The custom grew out of the fitness of things. The people in those countries wore sandals.

The sandal was at first a flat piece of wood or leather, suited to the sole of the foot, and bound upon it by straps or strings. The fastening was called a *latchet*. Christ and His disciples wore sandals. John the Baptist says of Christ, "Whose shoe's latchet I am unworthy to unloose," John i. 27. And Christ said to His twelve disciples, when He sent them forth to preach, "Be shod with sandals." The sandal was easily stripped off, and it afforded no protection from the dust and dirt. Sandals were never worn in the house, as it was considered a violation of good manners.

The necessity of washing the feet, therefore, after every walk, is obvious, and it was the first token of hospitality to supply water for this purpose. See with what generous hospitality Abraham, the father of the faithful, meets the three angels who visited him! It is said: "The Lord appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre: and he sat in the tent-door in the heat of the day; and he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, lo, three men stood by him: and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent-door, and bowed himself to the ground and said, My Lord, if now I have found favor in Thy sight, pass not away, I pray Thee, from Thy servant: Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree: and I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts; after that ye shall pass on: for therefore are ye come to your servant. And they said, So do, as thou hast said," Gen. xviii. 1-5.

Here is genuine hospitality, which stands in marked contrast with that which the same Lord received in the house of Simon. "Jesus turned to the woman and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest Me no water for My feet: but she hath washed My feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head," Luke vii. 44.

In both these cases we perceive that Feet-washing was a mark of hospitality. To unloose the straps or latchets of the sandals was the business of a menial

or servant, as was also the washing of feet. And this Feet-washing took place before eating, as we read in Judges xix. 21, "So he brought them into his house and gave provender unto their asses: and they washed their feet and did eat and drink." When David proposed to take Abigail to wife, it is said, "She arose, and bowed herself on her face to the earth, and said, Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my Lord," 1 Sam. xxv. 41. So also in Mark i. 7, "There cometh One mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose."

From these quotations we learn three things: (1) That the washing of feet was practiced from the time of Abraham to the time of Christ as a Jewish custom. (2) That it was a family custom practiced generally in the house in connection with the eating of a meal, and especially in connection with the eating of the evening meal. (3) That the washing of the feet was the business of a menial or servant.

We will now take up the second point of the proposition under consideration. It is this: That Feet-washing was an eastern usage connected with the celebration of the Jewish Legal Passover. We offer the following proof:

1. Dr. Lange, in his Commentary on Matthew, says: "On the first day of unleavened bread—that is, on the 14th of Nisan—the paschal feast, according to Matthew, was made ready. On that day the

leavened bread was removed. On the evening of that day, before 6 o'clock, and thus at the point of transition from the 14th to the 15th, the legal pass-over was introduced by the Feet-washing."

2. Dr. Neander, in his *Life of Christ*, says: "Peter, alarmed, cried out, 'Yea, if it be so, *Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head.*'" To this Christ replied: "*That is too much: he that is washed (bathed) needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.*" A figure taken from eastern usage: he that is already bathed, need only, on coming in from the road, wash off the soil that may have gathered on his feet."

3. Dr. Strong, in his *Harmony*, says: "There had just occurred an altercation among the disciples, as to which of them was entitled to the pre-eminence in rank. The dispute probably took place as they were taking their relative positions at the table, a point of great etiquette among orientals. Jesus therefore at this stage of the supper arose from the supper table with the design of checking this ambitious spirit in His apostles by a last emphatic act of authority, and laying aside His upper garments, He took a towel and wound it around His waist, in the manner of a servant preparing to wait upon the company then in order of performing the ablution connected with the paschal meal."

4. It has already been proved that Feet-washing was an eastern usage practiced at ordinary meals among the Jews. But the Jewish Legal Passover took

the place of the ordinary supper on the 15th of Nisan. Therefore, if Feet-washing was practiced at ordinary suppers, it was also most assuredly practiced, according to the teaching of Lange, Neander and Strong, at the celebration of the Jewish Passover. But Christ ate the regular passover with His disciples, and found Feet-washing already established as a Jewish custom, and did not then and there ordain Feet-washing as a sacrament of His Church.

The practice of Feet-washing, as noticed in the Scriptures, was nothing but a Jewish custom, resulting from the nature of things. It is well known that the Holy Scriptures were written in the east, and they have come to us in all their primitive, native simplicity; so that they, although translated, carry with them, more or less, the nature and style of the languages then spoken: and many of the expressions have reference to the climate varying from ours; customs and manners of a people differing greatly from us. To have then a correct view of Feet-washing, we must, (1) be made acquainted with the facts that the climate in that country is warm; that it rarely rains during the summer, which lasts six months; and hence the roads become very dry and dusty; that there is no spring nor fall, and that during the remainder of the year it mostly rains, which is their winter. (2) That the shoes worn are sandals, or soles without uppers, tied to the feet, and these are worn without stockings. Thus, then, we can readily imagine the state and condition of the

feet under such usage. It is proved, therefore, that Feet-washing was only a Jewish custom, practiced without any previous legislation from heaven, and without any special reference to religion, except as a mark of hospitality (1 Tim. v. 10) and as cleanliness is a part of godliness.

In this connection it seems proper and necessary that we should consider more minutely the celebration of the Jewish Legal Passover, with which we have shown Feet-washing to have been combined as a Jewish custom.

The company at table might not be less than ten persons (Josephus Bell. Jud. 6, 9, 3). It generally included from ten to twenty, according to the family, or as enlarged by strangers. The rites of the feast were regulated by the succession of cups, filled with red wine, commonly mixed with water.

1. *Announcement of the feast.* The head of the house uttered the thanksgiving or benediction over the wine and the feast, drinking the first cup. Then followed the remainder of the household. Then the washing of hands and feet after praise.

2. They then ate the bitter herbs, dipped in vinegar or salt-water, in remembrance of the sorrows which their fathers underwent in Egypt. Meanwhile the paschal dishes were brought in—the well-seasoned broth, the unleavened loaves, the festal offerings and the lamb. All these were then explained. They sung the first part of the Hallel, or song of praise, Ps. 113; Ps. 114; and the second cup was drunk.

3. Then began the feast proper (at which they reclined): the householder took two loaves, broke one in two, laid it upon the whole loaf, blessed it, wrapped it with bitter herbs, dipped it, ate of it, and handed it around with the words: "This is the bread of affliction, which your father's ate in Egypt." He then blessed the Paschal Lamb, and ate of it; the festal offerings were eaten with the bread dipped in the broth; and finally the lamb. The thanksgiving for the meal followed the blessing and drinking of the third cup.

4. The remainder of the Hallel was sung, Ps. 115; 118; and the fourth cup was drunk. Occasionally a fifth cup followed, while Ps. 120 and Ps. 127 were pronounced, but no more.

The first cup was thus devoted to the announcement of the feast; and Luke tells us that with this cup Christ announced to the disciples that this was the last feast He would celebrate with them in the world, and that He would celebrate a new feast with them in His Father's kingdom. The second cup was devoted to the interpretation of the festal act. The third cup followed the breaking of the loaves, which celebrated the unleavened bread, and was the cup of thanksgiving: this the Lord consecrated as the cup of the New Testament, as He had consecrated the breaking of bread as the remembrance of His broken body, the bread of life.

Let us now turn to the last legal paschal meal, that Jesus celebrated, according to the testimony of

Matthew, Mark and Luke, with His disciples, with some of the connecting events and discourses. We will follow Dr. Strong's "Harmony and Expositions of the Gospels."

"And in the evening" (Mark xiv. 17; Matt. xxvi. 20) "when the hour was come, He sat down and the twelve apostles were with Him," Luke xxii. 14.

What *evening* does Mark refer to and what *hour* does Luke mean? There is but one evening, which Mark can mean, and that was the evening of the same day that Jesus sent Peter and John to Jerusalem to prepare the passover, according to the Synoptists. But that day we have conclusively proved to have been the 14th of Nisan, which was a Thursday, toward the end of which the Paschal Lamb was killed. Toward that evening (Thursday), Jesus accompanied by His twelve apostles, set out from Bethany for the city of Jerusalem, and at the usual hour of the Paschal Supper, at six o'clock, the termination of the 14th of Nisan, and the beginning of the 15th of Nisan, soon after dark, took His place at the table thus prepared, surrounded by the entire number of His apostles. This is meant by the *evening* and the *hour*, mentioned by Mark and Luke, respectively.

There is another phrase, which must be settled by a reference to the Greek Testament, and that is, "*Sat down.*" Jesus and His disciples did not sit at table, after the modern fashion, but they *reclined at table*. The literal meaning of *anapipto* is to *recline at table*. This is the word which Luke uses; but

Matthew uses *anakeimai*, which also means *to be in a recumbent posture, to recline at table*.

Dr. Lange, on Matt. xxvi. 20, has the following: "*He reclined at table.*" According to the ancient custom of reclining at the table, with the left hand resting upon the couch. It is remarkable that the Jews themselves ventured to modify the legal prescription, which required them to eat the passover *standing*, with staff in hand, Ex. xii. 11. It does not appear that the directions given in this verse were held to be binding in the subsequent observance of the paschal rite. It is clear, at least that our Saviour and His apostles celebrated the passover in a *recumbent* posture, denoting ease and security, the contrary of the urgent haste of the Israelites on this occasion."

Dr. Schaff adds: "Dr. Wardsworth makes a liberal remark which is doubly to be appreciated as coming from a strict Episcopalian: 'God has commanded the attitude of *standing* in the reception of the paschal meal; the Jewish Church having come to the land of promise, and being there at *rest*, *reclined* at the festival, and our Lord conformed to that practice, a proof that positive commands of a ceremonial kind, even of divine origin, are not immutable if they are not in order to a permanent end.'"

It was, therefore, immediately before the eating of the passover, just as the Paschal Supper was served up, or, as we would say, made ready, as Jesus and His disciples were already reclining at the table,

when Jesus uttered these words: "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And He took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves," Luke xxii. 15-17. Here commenced the announcement of the feast. This cup was the first cup of the paschal feast. After this followed praise, and the washing of hands and feet.

There had just occurred an altercation among His disciples, as to which of them was entitled to pre-eminence in rank. Luke gives it thus: "And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted greatest." This dispute probably took place as they were taking their relative position at the table, a point of great etiquette among the orientals. On this Olshausen says: "At this point arose no doubt the strife, which occasioned the Feet-washing by the Saviour. This happened as manifest from John xiii. 4, compared with verse 12th, after they had sat down to the meal, and during the presence of Judas. So that the Saviour must have washed His very betrayer's feet, which renders His humility more striking. The contention arose concerning their several places at the table. See verse 27th, "But I am among you as He that serveth." Ewald, on this point says: "Luke here puts together (verses 21-28) a number of expressions of Jesus which, according to Matthew and Mark, are

spoken partly earlier and partly later, as if this sublime point of history were peculiarly adapted for attaching to the words of institution of the Holy Supper, similar thoughts respecting the faithfulness of the disciples toward Him."

This leads us in regular order to John xiii. 1-15: "*Now before the feast of passover.*" This is a phrase whose exact import is quite important in the settlement of this controversy. Some have interpreted this to mean a whole day before the passover; and it is one of the slender points on which the advocates for another feast than the passover build their theory. But by an examination of the Greek herein employed, no day appears. The Greek of the phrase is simply this: "*Pro de tes heortes tou pascha,*" "*But before the feast of the passover.*" By what rule can a phrase, expressing *indefinite* time be made to mean the *definite* time of a day? The feast began about 6 o'clock, according to our time, and it would be very strange if the expression, "*Before the feast,*" must be made to mean "*a day before.*" It would be much nearer, according to the Greek, to say, "*just before*" or "*shortly before.*" W. Bäumlein, one of the latest commentators on John's Gospel, explains the phrase, "*Unmittelbar vor dem Paschafeste,*" i. e., "*immediately before the passover.*"

"*And supper being ended,*" v. 2. "*Being ended*" means *occurring* or *taking place*. The end of preparing it had arrived. The Greek for this is: "*Kai deipnou genomenou,*" which is thus translated by the

best critics: Stier and Theile say, "*Als das Abendmahl vorhanden,*" "*as the Supper was at hand or prepared.*" Berlenberger Bible says, "*Da das Abendmahl worden,*" "*while the Supper was occurring.*" Stoltz, "*Als das Mahlzeit bereitet war,*" "*as the Supper was prepared.*" Schotz, "*Wahrend Sie bei dem Abendmahl Satzen,*" "*while they were reclining at the Supper.*" De Wette, "*Als das Abendmahl anfing,*" "*as the Supper was commencing.*"

Jesus, therefore, at this stage of the feast, conscious of the responsible mission which His Heavenly Father had placed in His hands, with the design of checking this ambitious spirit of His apostles by a last emphatic act of authority, arose from the couch, and laying aside His upper garment, He took a towel and wound it around His waist, in the manner of a servant preparing to wait on company in the ceremony then in order of performing the ablution connected with the paschal meal.

In order to get a comprehensive view of this subject, we must compare Luke xxii. 24-30 with John xiii. 1-20. It appears from this that there was yet one Jewish custom unperformed before the passover could be eaten, and that was the washing of the feet, which had again become soiled in coming in from the bath. Who was to perform this menial service? Some one of the apostles *ought* to have performed it, as Christ told them afterwards; but their pride for pre-eminence would allow no one of them to undertake the service. Jesus waited and

the Supper was now ready, "served up," but none of His disciples moved to undertake this custom of washing the feet. Then Jesus arose, and took the place of a servant, and performed the menial work of washing the feet of His disciples. This act of Jesus completely subdued this ambitious spirit of His disciples, all which is gathered from the passages cited.

We come now to the third point: That Feet-washing was not practiced in the Apostolic Church as a Christian sacrament.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have a special history written for our guidance in these matters, but nothing is said in it of Feet-washing as a Christian sacrament to be observed in the public assemblies of the Church. Now, the apostles were either true to their commission or they were not. The Commission was this: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations," etc. Matt. xxviii. 19-20. But as Feet-washing is not mentioned among the sacraments in the Acts of the Apostles, therefore it could not have been in the Commission, or the apostles were not faithful even under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But such a position is absurd. They could not err in this matter, for the Lord was dwelling in them by His Spirit.

1 Tim. v. 9-10 is sometimes quoted in proof of Feet-washing; but any one can see that there is no allusion to Feet-washing as a Christian sacrament to be practiced in the public assemblies of the Church.

It is mentioned here only as a mark of Christian hospitality. A widow, who had not shown Christian hospitality in this way to the saints, was unworthy to be taken into the number of those who were widows indeed.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE TRUE DATE OF THE PASSOVER.

THE position of our opponents, to the views which have been set forth in the preceding discussion, is, that the meal mentioned in John xiii., which they say was no proper passover, took place on the 13th of Nisan.

BUT this is untenable, because Matthew, Mark and Luke expressly describe the Lord's meal as a pass-over celebrated at the legal time. Matt. xxvi. 17 says: "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread," etc. On the 14th of Nisan the leaven was removed, and the unleavened loaves took their place. It was the first day of unleavened bread, forming the foundation of the passover, which really did not begin until the 15th of Nisan. But the feast was reckoned to last eight days, as we have seen by Josephus: "Whence it is that, in memory of the want we were then in, we keep a feast for eight days, which is called *the feast of unleavened bread*." These words, according to Matthew and Josephus, are express against the ancient notion that Jesus celebrated the passover a day earlier.

Dr. Schaff, on this point, says: "*Te de prote ton*

azumon (Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread) are equivalent to the first day of the pass-over, and important to the settlement of the chronological difficulty. All are agreed that this was Thursday, since Christ died on Friday. But the question is as to the day of the month, viz., whether it was the 14th of Nisan, at the close of which the Passover Lamb was slain, as Dr. Lange, Wieseler, Hengstenberg, Baumlein, Andrews, and most modern commentators of this passage assert; or the 13th of Nisan, according to the view of the Greek Church and those commentators who, from a different point of view, try to harmonize the Synoptists with John. Had we no other guide in this matter than the Synoptists, every commentator would probably adopt the former view, for the following reasons:

1. It is the obvious meaning of the term used by all the Synoptists: "*the first day of unleavened bread*," especially if we compare Mark, who characterizes the day more fully by adding: "When they killed the passover (*i. e.*, here the Paschal Lamb)," and Luke, who says in equally clear terms: "When the pass-over must be killed."

It was toward the close of the 14th of Nisan (probably from 3 o'clock till dark, Deut. xvi. 6), that the Paschal Lamb was slain, and all preparations were made for the feast which began with the Paschal Supper at evening, *i. e.*, at the close of the 14th of Nisan and the beginning of the 15th of Nisan, which day was, strictly speaking, the first day of the feast,

although in popular language, the 14th was called the first day of the passover or of unleavened bread. See Ex. xii. 18: "In the first month (Nisan), on the 14th day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread until the one and twentieth day of the month at even." Comp. Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. xxviii. 16.

Dr. Robinson (Harm. p. 214) says: "The language of the Synoptists is full, explicit, and decided, to the effect that our Lord's last meal with His disciples was the regular and ordinary Paschal Supper of the Jews, introducing the festival of unleavened bread on the evening of the 14th of Nisan."

With this compare Meyer *in loco*: "Es is der 14. Nisan (nach den Synoptikern, Donnerstag) gemeint, mit dessen abend das Passah begann welcher aber schon ganz unter den Festagen mittgezählt ist, nach der populär ungenauen weise, in welcher auch Josephus, Antiq. 2, 15, 1, acht Festage Zählt."

2. It is very improbable that Christ, who came not to destroy but to fulfil, should have violated the legal time of the passover; and if He did so, we should have some intimation of the fact in the Gospel, Matt. v. 17.

3. *An anticipatory* sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb in the court of the temple, on the 13th of Nisan, a day before the legal time, would not have been permitted by the priests. Greswell quotes from Philo to the effect that each man was then his own priest, and could slay the lamb in his own dwelling. But the

weight of authority goes to show that the lamb must be slain in the temple and the blood sprinkled upon the altar, Deut. xvi. 5, 6; Ezra vi. 20; 2 Chron. xxxv. 11. Hence the Jews, since the destruction of the temple, have only a memorial passover, confined to the use of unleavened bread and bitter herbs with the usual Psalms and prayer. The difficulty then arises not from the plain statement of the Synoptists, but from certain passages in John which seem to contradict the former, and from the apparent probability that Christ should have been tried, condemned, and crucified on the 15th of Nisan, which was the most solemn day of the passover festival.

CHAPTER XX.

JOHN AND SYNOPTISTS HARMONIZED.

1. THE Legal Passover was introduced by Feet-Washing. (See Dr. Lange on Matt., p. 455.) This explains the representation of John xiii. 1-4: "Before the feast of the passover, Jesus ariseth from supper (the legal Paschal Supper) and layeth aside His garments." (That is, to perform the washing of feet). The feast itself began about 6 o'clock, and it would be very strange if the expression, "before the feast," must be made to mean "a day before." It would be much nearer to say, "*Now immediately before the passover,*" etc.

2. In John xiii. 27, Jesus said to Judas, "*That thou doest, do quickly;*" and some present thought he was commanded to go at once, before the opening of the feast, and buy what provisions were necessary to it. But they could not possibly have entertained such a thought, if the whole of the next day had been open to them for the purpose; although it was a very natural one if the time allowed for secular purposes was fast drawing to a close.

3. John xviii. 28, narrates that the Jews, on the morning of the crucifixion, might not enter with

Jesus into the Praetorium, "lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover." Since the defilement occasioned by entering a Gentile house lasted only one day, they might very well have gone into the Praetorium, and yet eat the passover after six o'clock; for the defilement would cease after six o'clock in the evening.

But, if they had eaten the Passover the evening before, they could not have entered the hall on the morning of the 15th of Nisan, lest they should desecrate the paschal feast upon which they had just entered. John here uses the ordinary and common expression, in the brief form, "To eat the passover." We have already proved from Luke and Josephus that the term passover covers the whole feast of unleavened bread, from the 14th to the 21st of Nisan, *inclusive*. Andrews says, that John in six out of nine times in which he uses the word *pascha*, applies it to the feast generally; that he, writing last of all the evangelists, speaks of Jewish rites independently as of things now superseded; that therefore "*to eat the passover*," might very well be used with reference to the sacrifices which followed the Paschal Supper on the 14th of Nisan.

4. The Jews urged (John xix. 31) on the burial of the crucified, that it should be done on Friday, the 15th of Nisan, which was the preparation for the coming Sabbath, as that Sabbath was a high day.

Wieseler says: "The day of preparation, *paraskeue*, does not signify before the passover, but the preparation before the first Sabbath of the passover.

To the Jews, the Friday was the eve of the Sabbath, or the day of preparation for the Sabbath; and if the passover chanced to begin on Friday, the next Saturday or Sabbath became a high day, *the great day of the feast.*"

The term, *paraskeue*, *preparation*, occurs six times in the gospel (Matt. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31, 42), and in all these cases it means *prosabbaton*, "the day before the Sabbath," as Mark xv. 42 expressly explains it.

Hence, *paraskeue*, *preparation*, is equivalent to Friday, and is so rendered in Syriac, according to Dr. Lange. The Jews observed Friday afternoon from three o'clock as the time for preparation for the Sabbath, which commenced at sunset (Jos., Antiq. 16, 2, 1).

5. The only difficulty is with John xix. 14: "It was the *paraskeue*, the preparation of the passover." But if *paraskeue* becomes the usual term for Friday, the phrase must mean *the Friday of the passover*, *i. e.*, the paschal week, according to the wider use of *pascha* in John. Campbell translates it: "Now it was the preparation of the paschal Sabbath."

Other reasons alleged in favor of the supposed difference of the days are these:

1. "*Impossibility of an execution on a feast day.*"

Against this, according to Dr. Lange, we have Rabbi Akiba: "Great transgressors were taken to Jerusalem, in order that they might be put to death at the feast, before the eyes of the people, Deut. xvii. 12, 13. Executions had a religious character."

They were symbols of judgment for warning and edification. Sad analogies are the Spanish *auto da fes*, as popular religious festivals.

To this may be added that the Jews attempted several times to sieze Jesus on the Sabbath or festival days, Luke iv. 26, 29 (on a Sabbath); John vii. 30, 32 (in the midst of the feast of tabernacles); vii. 37, 44, 45 (on the last day of the feast); x. 22, 39 (at the feast of dedication).

2. "*The women prepared their spices on the day of Jesus' death.*"

But we answer that on the mere feast days (not Sabbaths) spices might be prepared, and other things might be done (Lev. xxiii. 7, 8).

3. "The Synoptists as well as John describe the day of Christ's death as *paraskeue* and *prosabbaton*." We reply that the second of these terms simply proves the day to have been Friday.

Thus all the evidence brought forward to support the theory of a difference in the days, may be used on the opposite side.

In addition to this we must urge the following positive reasons in favor of our view:

1. It cannot be conceived that Jesus, led always by the Father through the path of legal ordinances, would celebrate the paschal feast a day before the time, and *thereby voluntarily* hasten His own death. See under this head Gal. iv. 4, 5.

2. Pilate released a prisoner to the Jews *en to pascha*, at the passover, John xviii. 39.

3. John, according to the testimony of the *Quartodecimans* of the Easter controversy, kept the feast on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, and therefore the same time with the Jews.

4. The argument used by the Fathers Clemens, Hippolitus, against the *Quartodecimans*, (the Fourteeners; that is, those who commemorated the Lord's death on the 14th of Nisan), that Jesus died on the legal day of the passover, *because He was the real Passover*, may be made to support the claims of the 15th of Nisan, although there is an evident confusion among these fathers in the counting of the days, and too much stress is laid on the fact that the Paschal Lamb was slain on the 14th of Nisan.

If Jesus died on the 15th of Nisan, He died on the day of the "legal" passover, for that day began at six o'clock at the end of the 14th of Nisan. If, on the other hand, it was three o'clock in the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan that He died, it would have been one day before the legal paschal day, which did not begin till six o'clock. Neglect of the difference between the Jewish and the Roman time (and our own) of reckoning from midnight has tended much to confuse this matter."—*Dr. Schaff*.

Three prominent thoughts or rather facts stand out in this investigation: (1) The Legal Jewish Passover; (2) Feet-washing, a Jewish custom associated with the Legal Passover; and (3) the institution of the Lord's Supper, or communion. But the Jewish dispensation having passed away, all that belongs to

the Legal Passover, as Feet-washing, etc., has also fallen away, and nothing remains but the Lord's Supper, or the Holy Communion, the only sacrament instituted at the time of the celebration of the Legal Passover by Christ and His disciples.

Feet-washing, therefore, has no claims whatever to be called a Christian sacrament, to be practiced by us Christians in the public assemblies of the Church.

THIS BOOK MAY BE KEPT
FOURTEEN DAYS

A FINE WILL BE CHARGED FOR EACH DAY THE BOOK IS KEPT OVERTIME.

[illegible]

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY



3 4320 00102 7475

234.161

B499b

32597

Bergstresser, Peter

Baptism and Feet-Washing

SEP 23 1983

307

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE
SEMINARY LIBRARY

A. No. 32597

D. D. No. 234.161

B499b

